

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

BY

TARAKNATH DAS, PH. D.

Author of "Is Japan a Menace to Asia?," "Sovereign Rights of
Indian Princes," "British Expansion in Tibet" etc.

*Calcutta,
India*

SARASWATY LIBRARY

Mcmxxxi.

Published by S. N. Shaw,
Saraswaty Library
Ramanath Mazumder St., Calcutta.

FOURTH EDITION

Second Indian Edition

Printed by S. N. Shaw
At Sree Saraswaty Press Ltd
CALCUTTA



DR. TARAKNATH DAS, M.A., PH. D.

TO

THE CAUSE OF WORLD PEACE
WITH JUSTICE AND LIBERTY OF ALL PEOPLES

"A statesman is the child of circumstances, a creature of his time ; a statesman is essentially a practical character, and when called to the helm of affairs he has not to enquire what may, in the past, have been his views on this or that subject. He has only to ascertain what is necessary and to discover the most satisfactory and complete method in which affairs can be conducted. I laugh at the objection brought against any one that at some earlier period in his career he urged a policy different from that which he advocates at the present. All I ask is that his present policy be calculated to achieve its end, and that he at the present moment be determined to serve his country in her present circumstances."

—*Disraeli*

(The ablest of British Imperilists)

"A statesman is the child of circumstances, a creature of his time ; a statesman is essentially a practical character, and when called to the helm of affairs he has not to enquire what may, in the past, have been his views on this or that subject. He has only to ascertain what is necessary and to discover the most satisfactory and complete method in which affairs can be conducted. I laugh at the objection brought against any one that at some earlier period in his career he urged a policy different from that which he advocates at the present. All I ask is that his present policy be calculated to achieve its end, and that he at the present moment be determined to serve his country in her present circumstances."

—*Disraeli*

(The ablest of British Imperilists)

INTRODUCTION

The history of civilization is that of a succession of empires. No sooner did a city arrive at a stage of advancement beyond its neighbours than it sought to express its civic consciousness by extending its rule over surrounding territory; and no sooner were men of the same race united by national consciousness than they sought to manifest their superiority by the conquest of other races and nations. Almost every people has been subject at some time or other to the imperialistic urge; and political institutions, whether tyranny, theocracy, oligarchy, or democracy, have lent themselves with equal freedom to its satisfaction. The long procession of empires, beginning with those of the Nile and the Euphrates valleys, includes Persia, Athens, Macedon, Rome, the Arabs, the Turks, Venice, Spain, Portugal, Holland, Sweden, France, Russia, Germany, Great Britain. Indeed, Mr. Scott Nearing raises the question, surprising to most of us, whether the United States is not an empire.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

We must agree that it will become so when its preoccupation with the rule of foreign possessions and dependencies becomes the controlling influence in its national policy.

The classic and typical case of empire in the world to-day is that of the British, and the core of that empire is India. Never before has a single group of such magnitude been held in subjection to another. The British Empire has indeed two aspects, that presented by the association of self-governing commonwealths and that presented by the foreign possessions, of which India is incomparably the chief. When they think of the former, British statesmen have ceased to think imperially, they have learned to think in terms of commonwealths. When they think of India, though they profess and even believe that their thought is entirely in the interest of India's welfare, they necessarily think in terms of British rule. India is the foundation of that imperial edifice which Lord Curzon felicitously compares to Tennyson's Palace of Art, possibly forgetting the tragedy of the soul which inhabited it. The question of imperialism, therefore—and if history means anything this is a question which the world must continue to face with arms until it is settled by reason—is peculiarly a question of India, and

INTRODUCTION

the freedom of India is thus essentially an interest of the world.

It is the special merit of Mr. Das's book that he brings out, largely by citations from British authorities, the extent to which the foreign policy of Great Britain has been determined by the possession of India. Since the end of the eighteenth century, when the immense legacy of the Moguls fell into her hands, her heart has been increasingly with this treasure ; and her attitude with respect to her neighbours has varied from conciliation to suspicion and hostility in the measure as their looks toward it became covetous or their gestures threatening. And on the other hand this treasure has been a challenge, a temptation, and an example to her rivals, who, moreover, have not failed to take advantage of this preoccupation of Great Britain to disturb her domestic security by alarms and to embroil her people in distant quarrels. It was the Napoleonic feint toward India that made the enmity of Great Britain implacable. It was the advance of Russia in Asia that committed Great Britain to the long continued policy of favouring the Turks. The possession of India determined the Asiatic policy of Great Britain, and her relations with Persia, Japan, and to a greater extent than appears on the surface, with

China. Fear for the Suez route to India forced Great Britain's hand against Egypt, and jealousy of the Bagdad route arrayed her against Germany. It is not too much to say that this gold hoard in the East caused Great Britain, like the giant Fafner, to turn herself into a dragon, watchful, warlike, ready to rush from its cave breathing fire, its existence a curse and a menace. Only this must be added, that instead of a mass of metal, the treasure over which Great Britain stands guard is composed of human beings. It would be a subject for a companion study to this of Mr. Das's to show how this tortuous and faithless foreign policy finds its reflection point by point in India, in a domestic regime of suppression and cruelty.

In the first place, then, this book is addressed to the public of Great Britain, where foreign policy has traditionally remained in the hands of the feudal aristocracy. One of the boasted gains of the late war is the assumption of democratic control over this policy. It is surely proper for the people who propose in future to have something to say about the conquests, alliances and wars which are conducted in their name, to acquaint themselves with the main springs of that policy to which their welfare and their lives are regularly sacrificed. One of the

INTRODUCTION

questions which the British democracy will have to meet in the immediate future is that of the value of the Indian connection to Great Britain itself, to India, to the world. Englishmen like Mr. Lionel Curtis have persuaded themselves that the position of India within the British Empire is an advantage from all three points of view. How can this be asserted in the face of the story of the poisoning of the springs of healthy, fruitful intercourse between Great Britain and the world? Wilfrid Blunt in his Diaries tells of a conversation between George Wyndham and himself in which it was agreed that if England were governed as in the eighteenth century, the oligarchy would cut loose from India—a course which to-day in the face of popular government no ministry could undertake and survive. It has been noted above that imperialism is a disease of nationalism from which democracy is not exempt, to which its yielding is, in fact, the more fatal. All the more reason, then, why it should purge itself of the taint by the exercise of intelligence and reason.

In the second place, Mr. Das addresses his book to India. It is by the acquiescence of the world that Great Britain has been able to maintain itself in possession of the Indian Empire, an acquiescence secured by propaganda, intrigue,

quid pro quo, alliance, intimidation, and war. It is only because of the myopic vision with which we tend to view the ethics of nations that the holding in political subjugation and social inferiority of three hundred millions of human beings by forty millions, who are for the most part entirely ignorant of and uninterested in their wards, does not appear at once as a hideous abnormality. Mr. Das argues that if this relation is to be broken it must be by the withdrawal of such acquiescence and to this end India must cultivate foreign relations of her own. He doubtless has in mind the part which the benevolent attitude of foreign countries had in securing the freedom of Italy from Austria ; and of the American Colonies from Great Britain. For the Indians, looking toward a career as a nation, an explanation of the game of world politics, in which they have been so long the prize will be a necessary text book.

But above, all Mr. Das addresses his book to world, to that part of the world at least in which the mind is open and opinion is free on the subject of imperialism. Modern imperialism is no longer frankly predatory. It adopts a camouflage of benevolence and sentimentalizes itself as the white man's burden. It has tried to lay at rest the scandalous competition of the great

INTRODUCTION

powers in seizing the property of the weaker by organizing itself as the mandate trust of the League of Nations, a plunderbund for the benefit of the plundered. Under such hypocritical forms imperialism has made a great advance in the public opinion of the United States. With the merging of our western frontier in the Pacific Ocean our spirit of aggrandizement has gone forth to Hawaii, to the Philippines, to Cuba and Haiti, and hungrily envisages Mexico, always, be it understood, to uplift and protect. And with this account opened in the ledger of imperialism we tend to be less critical of the solvency of other imperialistic enterprises. Roosevelt with Panama and the Canal Zone on his conscience could not help addressing words of warm congratulation to the English on their superb performance in Egypt. Now Mr. Das offers us a fair account of one phase of imperialism, its bearing on the inter-relations of nations—a judgment and a warning. He asks us to consider in the light of history whether it is desirable for the world that the great classic instance of imperialism should continue. The freeing of India would go farther than any other conceivable action toward the settling of the question of imperial control throughout the world. And India would be freed if the

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

world viewed the monstrous nature of her subjection with clear, truthful eyes. Particularly could public opinion in the United States forward this result if it were as honest and generous as English public opinion was toward struggling Italy? We have heard much against shaking the bloody hand of Moscow. Let us consider whether the hand of London is any cleaner. Thus Mr. Das calls us to judgment; and at the same time he offers us a warning of the incredible complications into which our own imperialistic ventures may lead us, the mess of policy into which we shall be plunged to the exclusion of pressing considerations of domestic welfare, when we have fully given hostages to fortune. It is to be noted that Mr. Das does not plead the cause of India in the name of her own sufferings and indignities. He pleads it in the name of such honour as may be left among nations, in the name of British democracy, in the name of the world, so greatly in need of an act of healing and cleansing.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

CHAPTER TWO

ANGLO-FRENCH RIVALRY IN INDIA, 1763-1815

INDIA played an important part in the shaping of British foreign policy as early as 1688, in the reign of William III. Arthur Russel in his work on British foreign policy writes : "At the outset the object of the foreign policy of England on William's accession was to defeat the project of Louis XIV indirectly in the colonies and India and more directly in Ireland and on the continent." ¹¹

The same author points out that "after the Treaty of Utrecht, the character of the conflict with France and Spain changes and the issues become more vital. The struggle between Great Britain and the Bourbons is for ascendancy on the sea, in India, in the West Indies and on the American continent." ¹²

The Treaty of Paris (1763), established Great Britain as the leading state in the world. Mr.

¹¹ RUSSELL, ARTHUR : *History of British Foreign Policy*, p. 157.

¹² IBID., p. 172

Russell estimates the relative positions of England and France in the following words: "The peace was the culminating point of British power in the eighteenth century, nay, relatively to all other states, England has never since been so great. The foundation of the British Empire was laid, its future expansion in India and Canada was assured. It was not, however, till the fall of Napoleon that the British Empire was free to expand without danger of any serious interruption from external foes."¹³

The period of 1739—1763 has been characterized by Professor Montague Burrows as the period in which the dramas enacted on the plains of Bengal and Karnatics paved the way for British supremacy in India.

Referring to the principles that governed British foreign policy during the Seven Years' War (1756—1763), Burrows recognizes the important elements which have determined Britain's later policy as well. He points out, "...the recovery of an imperial position by the British people was marked by the welding of the old and the new elements of foreign policy.... The security of the country from invasion was to be guarded as of old by sea supremacy. The coasts of the Netherlands must be in friendly hands; the colo-

¹³ RUSSELL, ARTHUR : *History of British Foreign Policy*, p. 199

nies must be saved from absorption by the French and Spaniards, who had been for so long a time laying their hostile plans ; India must be kept free for the development of British trade and government; the Mediterranean must be retained at any cost by a sufficient fleet and by the help of its fortified depots at Gibraltar and Minorca. For the latter of these, Malta, later on became the the substitute." ¹⁴

Anglo-French hostility during the period of the French Revolution, particularly between the years 1793 and 1800, was intensified by the Indian question. "Great Britain would never have given up the struggle for the Mediterranean ; Napoleon would never have rested till he had acquired the command of it.... The eyes of the brilliant young conqueror (Napoleon) turned towards the alternative of ruining the only country which he really feared, by blocking her way to India through the roads of Egypt and Turkey and by setting up at Constantinople a great French Empire which might gradually tear away India by the help of a French organization of the great Marhatta princes." ¹⁵

¹⁴ BURROWS, MONTAGUE : *The History of the Foreign Policy of Great Britain*, p. 114.

¹⁵ BURROWS, *Ibid.*, p. 197,

The Indian problem influenced French diplomacy in regard to extending aid to the American colonies fighting against Great Britain. Wharton, in his "Diplomatic History of the American Revolution" correctly analyzes the situation: It would be a mistake to attribute the French support of America exclusively to a feeling of revenge for the humiliations of the prior war. Other motives came in and exercised decisive influence. There was a conviction and a right one in France that for Britain to hold under control the whole of North America as well as India would give her a maritime supremacy as well as a superiority in wealth which will constitute a standing menace to the rest of the world."¹⁶

William Pitt, more than any other statesman, was responsible for the policy which led to the triumph of England over France in the Seven Years' War. It was he who realized that France should be defeated, not on the banks of the Rhine, but in her colonies. In the reconstruction period which followed the Treaty of Paris, Pitt was the master mind who made it possible for England to progress on her imperial career.

Discussing Pitt's foreign policy in respect to the Orient, Gerald Burkeley Hertz writes: Pitt

¹⁶ WHARTON: *Diplomatic History of the American Revolution*, Vol. I, p. 43.

looked beyond the obvious and present facts, and foresaw the cloud that during the following century darkened the horizon of British India. In his means were not wholly happy in 1719, his ends at least have commended themselves to posterity. He sought to strengthen British influence in the East, to enforce peace throughout Europe to lighten the heavy burden of safe-guarding the north-western frontier of India, and to postpone for so long a period as might be possible, the extension of Russian sovereignties to the shores of the Mediterranean.”¹⁷

During the period of the Napoleonic War about 1807—1808, Britain took possession of the Dutch territory of Cape of Good Hope for the sake of India ; and Professor Burrows speaks of this incident in the following way :

“Almost unobserved, however, a Dutch colony was at this very time appropriated by the British and quite unexpected consequences have resulted. It was the Cape of Good Hope, which seemed at first to be only useful as commanding the highway to India, but which has led to the extension of British power and influence over a large portion of the African continent.”¹⁸

¹⁷ HERTZ, GERALD BURKELEY : *British Imperialism in the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 208-209.

¹⁸ BURROWS, MONTAGUE : *History of Foreign Policy of Great Britain*, p. 308.

At the Congress of Vienna (1815) Britain's policy was largely determined by the desire to control the trade-routes to India. "Of all that she had taken from France and her allies, she retained only the necessary posts of her commerce in India. The Mediterranean, the West Indies and the German Ocean, the Isle of France, Malta, Heligoland, Tobago and St. Lucia formed the whole of her [Britain's] gain."¹⁹

Since 1827, according to Professor Burrows, India has been the centre of Britain's Oriental policy: "She [Britain] had conquered the Mediterranean at the Battle of the Nile; and every day made it more apparent to statesmen that India could not be retained if a hostile power occupied the Levant. Each year also the enormous responsibility which the possession of India meant was brought more and more home to the British nation by dangerous wars and insurrections."²⁰

Earl Curzon, recently British Foreign Minister and former Viceroy of India, in his most remarkable work, "The Problems of the Far East," published in 1894, admits in unmistakable terms that India is the foundation-stone of the British Empire.

¹⁹ IBID. p. 308.

²⁰ BURROWS, MONTAGUE: *History of Foreign Policy of Great Britain*, p. 350.

CHAPTER TWO

ANGLO-FRENCH RIVALRY IN INDIA, 1763-1815

INDIA played an important part in the shaping of British foreign policy as early as 1688, in the reign of William III. Arthur Russel in his work on British foreign policy writes: "At the outset the object of the foreign policy of England on William's accession was to defeat the project of Louis XIV indirectly in the colonies and India and more directly in Ireland and on the continent."¹¹

The same author points out that "after the Treaty of Utrecht, the character of the conflict with France and Spain changes and the issues become more vital. The struggle between Great Britain and the Bourbons is for ascendancy on the sea, in India, in the West Indies and on the American continent."¹²

The Treaty of Paris (1763), established Great Britain as the leading state in the world. Mr.

¹¹ RUSSELL, ARTHUR: *History of British Foreign Policy*, p. 157.

¹² *IBID.*, p. 172

Russell estimates the relative positions of England and France in the following words: "The peace was the culminating point of British power in the eighteenth century, nay, relatively to all other states, England has never since been so great. The foundation of the British Empire was laid, its future expansion in India and Canada was assured. It was not, however, till the fall of Napoleon that the British Empire was free to expand without danger of any serious interruption from external foes."¹³

The period of 1739—1763 has been characterized by Professor Montague Burrows as the period in which the dramas enacted on the plains of Bengal and Karnatics paved the way for British supremacy in India.

Referring to the principles that governed British foreign policy during the Seven Years' War (1756—1763), Burrows recognizes the important elements which have determined Britain's later policy as well. He points out, "...the recovery of an imperial position by the British people was marked by the welding of the old and the new elements of foreign policy.... The security of the country from invasion was to be guarded as of old by sea supremacy. The coasts of the Netherlands must be in friendly hands; the colo-

¹³ RUSSELL, ARTHUR: *History of British Foreign Policy*, p. 199

CHAPTER TWO

ANGLO-FRENCH RIVALRY IN INDIA, 1763-1815

INDIA played an important part in the shaping of British foreign policy as early as 1688, in the reign of William III. Arthur Russel in his work on British foreign policy writes : "At the outset the object of the foreign policy of England on William's accession was to defeat the project of Louis XIV indirectly in the colonies and India and more directly in Ireland and on the continent." ¹¹

The same author points out that "after the Treaty of Utrecht, the character of the conflict with France and Spain changes and the issues become more vital. The struggle between Great Britain and the Bourbons is for ascendancy on the sea, in India, in the West Indies and on the American continent." ¹²

The Treaty of Paris (1763), established Great Britain as the leading state in the world. Mr.

¹¹ RUSSELL, ARTHUR : *History of British Foreign Policy*, p. 157.
¹² IBID., p. 172

Russell estimates the relative positions of England and France in the following words: "The peace was the culminating point of British power in the eighteenth century, nay, relatively to all other states, England has never since been so great. The foundation of the British Empire was laid, its future expansion in India and Canada was assured. It was not, however, till the fall of Napoleon that the British Empire was free to expand without danger of any serious interruption from external foes."¹

The period of 1739—1763 has been characterized by Professor Montague Burrows as the period in which the dramas enacted on the plains of Bengal and Karnatics paved the way for British supremacy in India.

Referring to the principles that governed British foreign policy during the Seven Years' War (1756—1763), Burrows recognizes the important elements which have determined Britain's later policy as well. He points out, "...the recovery of an imperial position by the British people was marked by the welding of the old and the new elements of foreign policy.... The security of the country from invasion was to be guarded as of old by sea supremacy. The coasts of the Netherlands must be in friendly hands; the colo-

¹ RUSSELL, ARTHUR: *History of British Foreign Policy*, p. 199

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

nies must be saved from absorption by the French and Spaniards, who had been for so long a time laying their hostile plans; India must be kept free for the development of British trade and government; the Mediterranean must be retained at any cost by a sufficient fleet and by the help of its fortified depots at Gibraltar and Minorca. For the latter of these, Malta, later on became the substitute." ¹⁴

Anglo-French hostility during the period of the French Revolution, particularly between the years 1793 and 1800, was intensified by the Indian question. "Great Britain would never have given up the struggle for the Mediterranean; Napoleon would never have rested till he had acquired the command of it.... The eyes of the brilliant young conqueror (Napoleon) turned towards the alternative of ruining the only country which he really feared, by blocking her way to India through the roads of Egypt and Turkey and by setting up at Constantinople a great French Empire which might gradually tear away India by the help of a French organization of the great Marhatta princes." ¹⁵

¹⁴ BURROWS, MONTAGUE: *The History of the Foreign Policy of Great Britain*, p. 114.

¹⁵ BURROWS, *Ibid.*, p. 197.

The Indian problem influenced French diplomacy in regard to extending aid to the American colonies fighting against Great Britain. Wharton, in his "Diplomatic History of the American Revolution" correctly analyzes the situation: It would be a mistake to attribute the French support of America exclusively to a feeling of revenge for the humiliations of the prior war. Other motives came in and exercised decisive influence. There was a conviction and a right one in France that for Britain to hold under control the whole of North America as well as India would give her a maritime supremacy as well as a superiority in wealth which will constitute a standing menace to the rest of the world."¹⁶

William Pitt, more than any other statesman, was responsible for the policy which led to the triumph of England over France in the Seven Years' War. It was he who realized that France should be defeated, not on the banks of the Rhine, but in her colonies. In the reconstruction period which followed the Treaty of Paris, Pitt was the master mind who made it possible for England to progress on her imperial career.

Discussing Pitt's foreign policy in respect to the Orient, Gerald Burkeley Hertz writes: Pitt

¹⁶ WHARTON: *Diplomatic History of the American Revolution*, Vol. I, p. 43.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

"Whatever the future may bring forth to this country [England]," he writes, "it cannot fail to be a matter of capital importance, seeing that the Empire of Great Britain, though a European, a Canadian and Australian, is before all else an Asiatic Dominion. We still are, and have it in our hands to remain, the First Power in the East. Just as De Tocqueville remarked that the conquest and government of India are really the achievements which have given England her place in the opinion of the world, so it is the prestige and the wealth arising from her Asiatic position that are the foundation-stones of the British Empire." ²⁰

²⁰ BURROWS, MONTAGUE : *History of Foreign Policy of Great Britain*, p. 350.

²¹ CURZON, EARL : *Problems of the Far East*, p. 414.



CHAPTER THREE



ANGLO-RUSSIAN RELATIONS ON THE INDIAN FRONTIER

PROFESSOR HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS, in referring to the influence of India upon England's foreign relations, says, "None can understand the foreign policy of Great Britain, which has inspired military and diplomatic activities from the Napoleonic Wars to the present day, who does not interpret wars, diplomatic conflicts, treaties and alliances, territorial annexations, extensions of protectorates, with the fact of India constantly in mind." ²²

The advent of Russia on the Indian frontier after the French danger had paled and vanished is described by Arthur Jose, in a graphic manner: "and then from the landward, across the deserts and the mountain ranges of our north-eastern frontier, loomed up the shadow of a more gigantic rival, of whom little was

²² GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS : *The New Map of Asia*, p. 4.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

understood and nothing could be predicted but unremitting progress and increasing power."

The First Afghan War, in 1838, resulted from the penetration of Russian agents into Afghanistan and the friendly reception accorded to them by the ruler of that state. William Cargill points out that during Palmerston's administration because of the Indian question there was constant conflict between Russian and British policies. He analyzes the situation as follows: "According to what we have here been advancing, the objects of Russia, as laid down by Peter the Great are :

1. The acquisition of Turkey, and seizure of Constantinople
2. The domination of Persia and Central Asia
3. The possession of the Black Sea, the Caspian and the extension of influence to the Levant and Mediterranean and possession of India." ²³

The article of the Will of Peter the Great which directly deals about India is as follows :

"Art. VIII. Bear in mind that the commerce of India is the commerce of the world, and that he who can exclusively command it is dictator of Europe. No occasion should therefore be lost to

²³ CARGILL WILLIAM: *Foreign Affairs of Great Britain Administered by Palmerston*, pp. 25-26.

provoke war with Persia, to hasten its decay, to advance on the Persian Gulf, and then to endeavour to re-establish the ancient trade of Levant through Syria." ²⁴

Referring to Britain's anti-French and anti-Russian policy even after the Franco-Prussian War, Professor Charles Cestre writes: "After 1870, England at first remained faithful to the policy which, with few exceptions, had been the constant rule for her exterior relations, namely, more or less direct co-operation with the states of Central Europe against France and Russia.France, despite her reverses, continued to be the distrusted neighbour. She stood at the gates of the channel, she was a great sea power, and since the consolidation of her Algerian possessions, she was a great Mediterranean power as well. Russia was the suspected neighbour at the frontiers of India, disturbing on account of the incessant growth of her population, her uninterrupted penetration of Asia and her desire to open a way into the Mediterranean. Consequently there was a tendency on the part of England, without abandoning her insular reserve, to favor the policy of

²⁴ SIR ARCHIBALD COLQUHOUN gives the complete text of *The Will of Peter the Great* as given in *De Progres de la Puissance Russe* by M. LESUE published in Paris 1812, in his work *Russia Against India*. pp. 239 240.

Germany and Austria and to check the policy of France and Russia."²⁵ According to the same authority, "England could not allow Russia to use the disturbance in the Balkans as a pretext to enter Constantinople and become more than ever a menace to India. England consequently declared herself protectress of Turkey."²⁶ He further comments: "After having constructed a barrier in the Congress of Berlin against the Russian Spectre, Disraeli prepared an era of conquering experience in Africa and Asia."²⁷

Professor Burrows refers to Anglo-Russian relations in the following terms: "Lord Beaconsfield's policy towards Russia was due to India. The specific points are (1) buying the Suez Canal, (2) securing Cyprus as the British station at Levant—as a result of the Crimean War, (3) Berlin Congress to restrain Russia from being all powerful regarding Turkish questions menacing Britain in Asia, particularly in India."²⁸

At this period England was not in a position to take Egyptian territory, and had no position

²⁵ CESTRE, CHARLES: *France, England and European Democracy*, pp. 73.

²⁶ *IBID.*, pp. 75

²⁷ *IBID.*, pp. 76,

²⁸ BURROWS, p. 353.

in Egypt close to the Canal itself, and thus Cyprus, as the nearest island to the Suez Canal, offered special advantages. After the Treaty of San Stefano and the revision of the Russo-Turkish Treaty at Berlin, in 1878, the interest of Great Britain was directed to the south-east Mediterranean. "She decided that her permanent route to India was through the Suez Canal, and made it secure by getting possession of the majority of the shares of the Canal and by seizing Egypt."^{2 3}

Lt.-Col. S. C. Vestal, in his recent book, confirms the judgment of earlier writers in respect to the influence which India has had on the course of Anglo-Russian relations. He says, "It is customary to class Anglo-Saxons as the least militant, the least war-like of the race. The fact is that these nations are the most war-like of living peoples. They are so war-like that they will not suffer any nation on the same continent or island with themselves against whom it is necessary to keep a large standing army on foot....."

"The Anglo-Saxon world taken as a unit has no frontier in close contact with powerful nation. Its boundaries are formed by the sea or by the territories of weak people, from whom

^{2 3} GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS : *The New Map of Europe*, p. 140

there is no cause to fear invasion. The north-west frontier of India is an apparent exception, but it is only apparent. The Russian territory is still a long way from the vital part of India; the frontier is strong by nature and has been strengthened by art; and the British have abundant means to bring to bear on Russia in other parts of the world whenever the north-west frontier is threatened. Nevertheless, it is true that the British foreign policy for seventy years has been dominated by the necessity of keeping Russia at a safe distance from India.”⁸⁰

Disraeli, speaking in the House of Commons on July 18, 1878, said: “Our Indian Empire on every occasion on which these discussions occur or these troubles occur, or these settlements occur [he was referring to the Berlin Treaty of 1878] is to England a source of grave anxiety, and the time appeared to have arrived, when, if possible, we should terminate that anxiety... But yielding to Russia what she has obtained, we may say to her—Thus far and no further! Asia is large enough for both of us. There is no reason for these constant wars or fears of wars between Russia and England... But the room we require we must

⁸⁰ VESTAL, LT.-COL. S. C.: *The Maintenance of Peace*, p. 55
(This paragraph was written in 1912.)

secure. We therefore entered into an alliance—a defensive alliance with Turkey to guard her against any further attack from Russia.”³¹

In the period following the Treaty of Berlin (1878) Russian relations with the Balkan countries produced a reaction against her in the minds of English conservatives. Russia's approach to Constantinople filled them with consternation, for Constantinople guarded the gateway to Asia. Russian expansion into Central Asia alarmed the British Government and one of the means chosen to offset it was the creation of a buffer state out of Afghanistan. In retaliation, Russia tried to extend her influence all around Afghanistan, in Persia, in Turkestan, and followed this by the occupation of strategic trade centres in Central Asia. Tibet, a province of China, adjoining India on the north-eastern boundary, became the counter goal of Russia, as an offset to British trade gains in Afghanistan. The rival claims of Russia and Britain in Persia were compromised by the Anglo-Persian Convention of 1907. Nevertheless, this country, as well as Afghanistan and Tibet, became to the Government of India and to the British Foreign Office, safeguards which must be added to the British Empire.

³¹ JONES, EDGAR R. : *Selected Speeches on British Foreign Policy, 1738-1914*, pp. 93-98.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

Next came the menace to India through Russia's approach to the Persian Gulf and her interest in Bagdad Railway. At this point a new rival threatened prestige in the East, and the enmity formerly directed toward Russia was diverted to Germany. "Having compounded colonial rivalries with France and Russia, she had no way of arriving at a diplomatic understanding with Germany. The Bagdad Railway question was decided on battlefields from Flanders to Mesopotamia." ¹²

¹² GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS : *The New Map of Asia*, p. 11.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANGLO-GERMAN RELATIONS AND INDIA

The general tendency of the foreign policy of Imperial Germany has been characterized by an American authority as an effort to acquire an empire of great magnitude, allying herself with Turkey against Britain and France.

"The rapid decline of the Ottoman Empire and the fact that its sovereign was Khalif of the Moslem world, led German statesmen to believe that Constantinople was the best place in the world to centre the efforts of their diplomacy in the development of the *Weltpolitik*. Though allying herself with the Khalif, Germany would find herself able to strike eventually at the British occupation of India and Egypt, and the French occupation of Algeria and Tunis, not only by joining the interests of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Germanism, but also by winning a place in Morocco, opposite Gibraltar, a place in Asia Minor opposite

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

understood and nothing could be predicted but unremitting progress and increasing power."

The First Afghan War, in 1838, resulted from the penetration of Russian agents into Afghanistan and the friendly reception accorded to them by the ruler of that state. William Cargill points out that during Palmerston's administration because of the Indian question there was constant conflict between Russian and British policies. He analyzes the situation as follows: "According to what we have here been advancing, the objects of Russia, as laid down by Peter the Great are :

1. The acquisition of Turkey, and seizure of Constantinople
2. The domination of Persia and Central Asia
3. The possession of the Black Sea, the Caspian and the extension of influence to the Levant and Mediterranean and possession of India." ²³

The article of the Will of Peter the Great which directly deals about India is as follows :

"Art. VIII. Bear in mind that the commerce of India is the commerce of the world, and that he who can exclusively command it is dictator of Europe. No occasion should therefore be lost to

²³ CARGILL WILLIAM: *Foreign Affairs of Great Britain Administered by Palmerston*, pp. 25-26.

provoke war with Persia, to hasten its decay, to advance on the Persian Gulf, and then to endeavour to re-establish the ancient trade of Levant through Syria." ²⁴

Referring to Britain's anti-French and anti-Russian policy even after the Franco-Prussian War, Professor Charles Cestre writes: "After 1870, England at first remained faithful to the policy which, with few exceptions, had been the constant rule for her exterior relations, namely, more or less direct co-operation with the states of Central Europe against France and Russia.France, despite her reverses, continued to be the distrusted neighbour. She stood at the gates of the channel, she was a great sea power, and since the consolidation of her Algerian possessions, she was a great Mediterranean power as well. Russia was the suspected neighbour at the frontiers of India, disturbing on account of the incessant growth of her population, her uninterrupted penetration of Asia and her desire to open a way into the Mediterranean. Consequently there was a tendency on the part of England, without abandoning her insular reserve, to favor the policy of

²⁴ SIR ARCHIBALD COLQUHOUN gives the complete text of *The Will of Peter the Great* as given in *De Progres de la Puissance Russe* by M. LESUR published in Paris 1812, in his work *Russia Against India*. pp. 239 240.

Germany and Austria and to check the policy of France and Russia."²⁵ According to the same authority, "England could not allow Russia to use the disturbance in the Balkans as a pretext to enter Constantinople and become more than ever a menace to India. England consequently declared herself protectress of Turkey."²⁶ He further comments: "After having constructed a barrier in the Congress of Berlin against the Russian Spectre, Disraeli prepared an era of conquering experience in Africa and Asia."²⁷

Professor Burrows refers to Anglo-Russian relations in the following terms: "Lord Beaconsfield's policy towards Russia was due to India. The specific points are (1) buying the Suez Canal, (2) securing Cyprus as the British station at Levant—as a result of the Crimean War. (3) Berlin Congress to restrain Russia from being all powerful regarding Turkish questions, menacing Britain in Asia, particularly in India."²⁸

At this period England was not in a position to take Egyptian territory, and had no position

²⁵ CESTRE, CHARLES: *France, England and European Democracy*, pp. 73.

²⁶ *IBID.*, pp. 75

²⁷ *IBID.*, pp. 76,

²⁸ BURROWS, p. 353.

in Egypt close to the Canal itself, and thus Cyprus, as the nearest island to the Suez Canal, offered special advantages. After the Treaty of San Stefano and the revision of the Russo-Turkish Treaty at Berlin, in 1878, the interest of Great Britain was directed to the south-east Mediterranean. "She decided that her permanent route to India was through the Suez Canal, and made it secure by getting possession of the majority of the shares of the Canal and by seizing Egypt."^{2 3}

Lt.-Col. S. C. Vestal, in his recent book, confirms the judgment of earlier writers in respect to the influence which India has had on the course of Anglo-Russian relations. He says, "It is customary to class Anglo-Saxons as the least militant, the least war-like of the race. The fact is that these nations are the most war-like of living peoples. They are so war-like that they will not suffer any nation on the same continent or island with themselves against whom it is necessary to keep a large standing army on foot....."

"The Anglo-Saxon world taken as a unit has no frontier in close contact with powerful nation. Its boundaries are formed by the sea or by the territories of weak people, from whom

^{2 3} GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS: *The New Map of Europe*, p. 140

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

there is no cause to fear invasion. The north-west frontier of India is an apparent exception, but it is only apparent. The Russian territory is still a long way from the vital part of India; the frontier is strong by nature and has been strengthened by art; and the British have abundant means to bring to bear on Russia in other parts of the world whenever the north-west frontier is threatened. Nevertheless, it is true that the British foreign policy for seventy years has been dominated by the necessity of keeping Russia at a safe distance from India."³⁰

Disraeli, speaking in the House of Commons on July 18, 1878, said: "Our Indian Empire on every occasion on which these discussions occur or these troubles occur, or these settlements occur [he was referring to the Berlin Treaty of 1878] is to England a source of grave anxiety, and the time appeared to have arrived, when, if possible, we should terminate that anxiety... But yielding to Russia what she has obtained, we may say to her—Thus far and no further! Asia is large enough for both of us. There is no reason for these constant wars or fears of wars between Russia and England.... But the room we require we must

³⁰ VESTAL, LT.-COL. S. C.: *The Maintenance of Peace*, p. 55
(This paragraph was written in 1912.)

secure. We therefore entered into an alliance—a defensive alliance with Turkey to guard her against any further attack from Russia.”³¹

In the period following the Treaty of Berlin (1878) Russian relations with the Balkan countries produced a reaction against her in the minds of English conservatives. Russia's approach to Constantinople filled them with consternation, for Constantinople guarded the gateway to Asia. Russian expansion into Central Asia alarmed the British Government and one of the means chosen to offset it was the creation of a buffer state out of Afghanistan. In retaliation, Russia tried to extend her influence all around Afghanistan, in Persia, in Turkestan, and followed this by the occupation of strategic trade centres in Central Asia. Tibet, a province of China, adjoining India on the north-eastern boundary, became the counter goal of Russia, as an offset to British trade gains in Afghanistan. The rival claims of Russia and Britain in Persia were compromised by the Anglo-Persian Convention of 1907. Nevertheless, this country, as well as Afghanistan and Tibet, became to the Government of India and to the British Foreign Office, safeguards which must be added to the British Empire.

³¹ JONES, EDGAR R. : *Selected Speeches on British Foreign Policy, 1738-1914*, pp. 93-98.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

Next came the menace to India through Russia's approach to the Persian Gulf and her interest in Bagdad Railway. At this point a new rival threatened prestige in the East, and the enmity formerly directed toward Russia was diverted to Germany. "Having compounded colonial rivalries with France and Russia, she had no way of arriving at a diplomatic understanding with Germany. The Bagdad Railway question was decided on battlefields from Flanders to Mesopotamia." ²²

²² GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS : *The New Map of Asia*, p. 12.



CHAPTER FOUR



ANGLO-GERMAN RELATIONS AND INDIA

The general tendency of the foreign policy of Imperial Germany has been characterized by an American authority as an effort to acquire an empire of great magnitude, allying herself with Turkey against Britain and France.

"The rapid decline of the Ottoman Empire and the fact that its sovereign was Khalif of the Moslem world, led German statesmen to believe that Constantinople was the best place in the world to centre the efforts of their diplomacy in the development of the *Weltpolitik*. Though allying herself with the Khalif, Germany would find herself able to strike eventually at the British occupation of India and Egypt, and the French occupation of Algeria and Tunis, not only by joining the interests of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Germanism, but also by winning a place in Morocco, opposite Gibraltar, a place in Asia Minor opposite

Next came the menace to India through Russia's approach to the Persian Gulf and her interest in Bagdad Railway. At this point a new rival threatened prestige in the East, and the enmity formerly directed toward Russia was diverted to Germany. "Having compounded colonial rivalries with France and Russia, she had no way of arriving at a diplomatic understanding with Germany. The Bagdad Railway question was decided on battlefields from Flanders to Mesopotamia." ¹²

¹² GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS : *The New Map of Asia*, p. 12.



CHAPTER FOUR



ANGLO-GERMAN RELATIONS AND INDIA

The general tendency of the foreign policy of Imperial Germany has been characterized by an American authority as an effort to acquire an empire of great magnitude, allying herself with Turkey against Britain and France.

"The rapid decline of the Ottoman Empire and the fact that its sovereign was Khalif of the Moslem world, led German statesmen to believe that Constantinople was the best place in the world to centre the efforts of their diplomacy in the development of the *Weltpolitik*. Though allying herself with the Khalif, Germany would find herself able to strike eventually at the British occupation of India and Egypt, and the French occupation of Algeria and Tunis, not only by joining the interests of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Germanism, but also by winning a place in Morocco, opposite Gibraltar, a place in Asia Minor opposite

Egypt, and a place in Mesopotamia opposite India." ³³

But Britain, to safeguard her interests in India, kept a watchful eye against all nations, particularly Germany, in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia.

"British opposition to the German schemes (Berlin-Bagdad Railway, etc.) was not limited to the prevention of an outlet of the *Bagdadbahn* at Koweit. Since 1798, when the East India Company established a resident at Bagdad to spy upon and endeavour to frustrate the influence of the French, just beginning to penetrate towards India through the ambition of Napoleon to inherit the Empire of Alexander, British interests have not failed to be well looked after in Lower Mesopotamia." ³⁴

Traditional friendship was in existence between Britain and Germany until the latter became her rival :

"The circumstances and conditions that in the relations between Great Britain and France were constantly giving rise to rivalries, disputes, 'pin-pricks' and crises of greater or less acuteness, hardly existed between Great Britain and Germany.

³³ GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS : *The New Map of Europe*, P. 59.

³⁴ *IBID.*, p. 66.

... The Germans and the British had never been at war, or rather, speaking more accurately, British and German armies had never come into actual conflict. What, then was there till the last few years to make Englishmen seriously contemplate and prepare for a German war?" ³⁵

The answer to this question was given as early as May 30, 1857, when Otto von Bismarck wrote :

"England cannot look favourably on our chances of maritime development in commerce or in navies, and she is envious of our manufactures." ³⁶

Prince von Bulow has amplified the answer and said :

"The policy of no state in the world is as firmly bound by tradition as that of England, and it is in no small degree to the unbroken continuity of her foreign policy, handed down from century, pursuing its aims and definite lines independent of the change of party government that England has attained such magnificent success in world politics.... The alpha and omega of English policy has been the attainment and maintenance of English naval supremacy.

³⁵ ELLIOT, THE HON. ARTHUR : *Traditions of British Statesmanship* (1918), p. 24.

³⁶ MARCKS, PORF, ERICH : *England and Germany*, p. 49.

To this aim, all other considerations, friendships as well as enmities, have always been subordinated. For the attainment of this one object of English policy, Englishmen have at no time scrupled to use all the means at their disposal."¹⁷

Lord Haldane has given his views on the subject, showing how Britain was forced to make ententes with France and Russia and other powers to secure her own position against the growing naval power of Germany :

"As the navies of Europe were growing, not only those of France and Russia but that of Italy also, we had to look in the interest of our security, to friendly relations with these countries. We aimed at establishing such friendly relations, and our method was to get rid of all causes of friction in Newfoundland, in Egypt, in the East and in the Mediterranean. That was the policy which was implied in our ententes."¹⁸

He further amplifies this point and says :

"On Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg's own showing France and Russia would have remained too weak to entertain the hope of success in a conflict with the Triple Alliance and might have been won on the side of Ger

¹⁷ IBID., p. 44.

¹⁸ HALDANE, LORD : *Before the War*, pp. 87-88.

many. England would have been in such a case left in isolation in days when isolation ceased to be splendid. For, great as was her navy, it could not have been relied upon to protect her adequately against the combined navies of Germany, France, Russia, and Austria, with that of Italy possibly added. It was the apprehension occasioned by Germany's war-like policy that made it an unavoidable act of prudence to enter the Entente." ⁸⁹

Germany's growth as an industrial and commercial power ousting Britain from world markets, particularly in the Orient and India, made the Anglo-German rivalry more acute, leading to the conflict of 1914.

"The commerce of the Far East has always been one of the great prizes for which the European nations have struggled, and in this blatantly commercial age Germany could not afford to be left behind. Great Britain bestrode two routes, the one around the Cape of Good Hope, the other through the Suez Canal; Russia was established in Central Asia at the gate of India; she was pegging out another route by the Trans-Siberian Railway and her advance in Manchuria. A Germanized Turkey would give the fatherland

⁸⁹ IBID., pp. 100-101.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

an outlet ~~to~~ the Persian Gulf, from which steamship lines could carry German influence farther eastward; Persia might be brought under the spell; and even India, itself might succumb to Teutonic attraction. . . . " 40

As early as October, 1901, Lord Haldane in an address in Liverpool pointed out the seriousness of commercial rivalry between Germany and England:

"It is not wonderful that instead of having, as a few years ago we had, the lead of the world in the manufacture of steel, we have fallen behind the United States with their enormous natural resources. But it is startling that we have been beaten in this particular race by Germany. Great Britain regards herself as the leading industrial nation. She has been so long, and until recent times her place has not been seriously disputed. She must continue her commercial output, for it is the foundation on which rests her financial resources, her fleet, her hold on her colonies and dependencies." 41

He further illustrates the question of Anglo-German commercial rivalry:

40 SCHMITT, BERNADOTTE EVERLY; *England and Germany* (1740-1914), p. 264.

41 HALDANE, LORD RICHARD BURTON: *Education and Empire* (1902), p. 7.

an outlet to the Persian Gulf, from which steamship lines could carry German influence farther eastward; Persia might be brought under the spell; and even India, itself might succumb to Teutonic attraction. . . . " 40

As early as October, 1901, Lord Haldane in an address in Liverpool pointed out the seriousness of commercial rivalry between Germany and England:

"It is not wonderful that instead of having as a few years ago we had, the lead of the world in the manufacture of steel, we have fallen behind the United States with their enormous natural resources. But it is startling that we have been beaten in this particular race by Germany. Great Britain regards herself as the leading industrial nation. She has been so long, and until recent times her place has not been seriously disputed. She must continue her commercial output, for it is the foundation on which rests her financial resources, her fleet, her hold on her colonies and dependencies." 41

He further illustrates the question of Anglo-German commercial rivalry:

40 SCHMITT, BERNADOTTE EVERLY; *England and Germany (1740-1914)*, p. 264.

41 HALDANE, LORD RICHARD BURTON: *Education and Empire* (1902), p. 7.

"In 1866 Germany imported over 1000 tons of natural indigo. In 1896 she imported none, but exported 256 tons of the artificially produced article. One of the great natural products of India is in consequence in serious danger." ⁴²

Germany captured a large percentage of Indian trade before the World War, and her place in Indian export and import trade was only second to Great Britain's. This created greater jealousy against Germany. Britain began to talk about Imperial preference to preserve commercial supremacy in India.

As the result of the World War, Germany is no more threatening Britain in the Persian Gulf. She has lost her fleet and colonies, and her commerce is crippled, and she will at least for some time to come not become a serious menace to Britain. Hence Britain is rather anxious to be generous to Germany. There are two other factors which force Britain to be friendly. Britain knows that Anglo-Russian and Anglo-French rivalries are going to influence British world policies; and as Britain made an entente with Russia with the express purpose of lining her up against Germany, so German man-power and efficiency may be a great asset for Britain against any possible eventualities against France and

⁴² *IBID.*, p. 22.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

Russia. Whether Germany will agree to ally herself with Britain against France and Russia is not certain, but there is not the least doubt that Britain wants alliance with Germany. Indian statesmen should watch Germany, and must not be sentimental, but see where they can have common interests with that great nation. An Anglo-German alliance will not be an asset to India's future, but may be a stumbling block to achieving Indian independence.

CHAPTER FIVE

ANGLO-TURKISH RELATIONS AND INDIA

THE land trade-route between Asia and Europe has been the bone of contention between the Powers all along. Professor von Sybel in his study of the Crusades brings out clearly that the political control of these trade routes and the Turkish dominions in Asia Minor had a great deal to do with the European crusades against Islam. These considerations frequently motivated the unctious efforts to free the Christian peoples from Turkish misrule. For whenever peace with Turkey was politically and commercially advantageous, this peace was obtained with absolute disregard for the Christian minorities in Turkey.

“The Porte had been in close alliance with the English ever since the reign of Queen Elizabeth. ... The alliance of the Porte with France was indeed older than that with England; for a diversion from the side of Turkey had often been a part of French policy in their wars with Austria; and the

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

Russia. Whether Germany will agree to ally herself with Britain against France and Russia is not certain, but there is not the least doubt that Britain wants alliance with Germany. Indian statesmen should watch Germany, and must not be sentimental, but see where they can have common interests with that great nation. An Anglo-German alliance will not be an asset to India's future, but may be a stumbling block to achieving Indian independence.

CHAPTER FIVE

ANGLO-TURKISH RELATIONS AND INDIA

THE land trade-route between Asia and Europe has been the bone of contention between the Powers all along. Professor von Sybel in his study of the Crusades brings out clearly that the political control of these trade routes and the Turkish dominions in Asia Minor had a great deal to do with the European crusades against Islam. These considerations frequently motivated the unctious efforts to free the Christian peoples from Turkish misrule. For whenever peace with Turkey was politically and commercially advantageous, this peace was obtained with absolute disregard for the Christian minorities in Turkey.

"The Porte had been in close alliance with the English ever since the reign of Queen Elizabeth. ... The alliance of the Porte with France was indeed older than that with England; for a diversion from the side of Turkey had often been a part of French policy in their wars with Austria; and the

elder Pitt had, during the mortal struggle of the Seven Years' War, always favoured Russia as against France. Even Fox, in 1783, was deaf to the proposal of France that she and Great Britain should combine to check the aggressions of Russia upon Turkey, and upon what *remained of Poland*. The alliance of Great Britain and Turkey had in fact been hitherto only a commercial convention, but it was felt that the possession of India made it a very important alliance to the former of the two countries, and that circumstances might arise which would call for a more strictly political alliance." * 3

Again : "Throughout the middle of the nineteenth century, British foreign policy was built upon the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire. The Sultan of Turkey was the Khalif of the Mohammedan world. Russia was making great progress in Central Asia. This brought her to the northern and western confines of India and extended her sovereignty over Mohammedan nations. If Russia became the master of Turkey, not only would she have access to the Mediterranean but also she would control the destinies of Islam. The preservation of Britain's position in India and as a predominant power in the Moham-

* 3 BURROWS, MONTAGUE : *History of Foreign Policy of Britain* (Revised Edition 1897), pp. 125-126.

medan world depended upon checking Russia. British statesmen believed that the political independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire were essential to the British Empire overseas. The Crimean War was fought in this belief, and Russia was menaced with another war in 1877 in pursuance of the same policy. The Treaty of Berlin which superseded the Treaty of San Stefano was the work of British statesmen who did not hesitate to sacrifice the Christians under the Turkish yoke for the sake of British interests in India. This policy was abandoned because Egypt made no longer necessary its maintenance.”⁴⁴

British attitude towards Turkey during the period of the hundred years from the middle of the eighteenth century to the Crimean War has been thus described by John Morley :

“When the war began between Russia and the Porte in 1771 we [the British] supported Russia and helped her to obtain an establishment in the Black Sea. Towards the end of 1782 when Catherine by a sort of royal syllogism, as Fox called it, took the Crimea into her own hands, the Whig cabinet of the hour did not think it necessary to lend Turkey their support, though France and

⁴⁴ GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS : *The New Map of Africa*. pp. 392-393.

Spain proposed a combination to resist. Then came Pitt. This statesman whose qualities of greatness so profoundly impressed his contemporaries has usually been praised as a minister devoted to peace, and only driven by the French revolution into the long war. His preparations in 1791 for a war with Russia on behalf of the Turks are a serious deduction from this estimate. Happily the alarms of the Baltic trade, and the vigorous reasoning of Fox, produced such an effect upon opinion that Pitt was driven, on the peril of the overthrow of his government, to find the best expedient he could to bring the business to an end without extremities. In 1853 (Crimean War) the country was less fortunate than it had been in 1791.”^{4 5}

British pro-Russian policy of the eighteenth century can be explained from the fact that in India Britain found the French and the Moguls as her competitors, and a strong Turkey may be an aid to the Moguls. Pitt's pro-Turkish policy was due to French efforts to have an alliance with Tippu Sultan in Southern India; and France was trying to secure Russian aid to march towards India through Central Asia. The defeat of France in the great Napoleonic Wars (1815) and the elimination of France from India

^{4 5} MORLEY, JOHN : *The Life of Gladstone*, Vol. I, pp, 477-478

changed the situation, and again the British attitude became less friendly towards Turkey and more cordial towards Russia.

"In the war between Russia and Turkey in 1828, during the last stage of the struggle for Greek independence, Russia as a Greek champion against the Turk had the English popular support on her side; Palmerston was warmly with her (Russia), regarding even her (Russia's) advance to Constantinople with indifference; and Aberdeen was reproached as a Turkish sympathizer."^{4 5}

But just as soon as the Russian advance to Central Asia began to be regarded as a menace to British rule in India, the same Palmerston who was pro-Russian in 1828 now supported Turkey and entered the Crimean War, and British public sympathy was not for the miserable Christian victims of Turkish misrule but for Turkey.

"Assuming that Palmerston was right in believing that Russia was aiming at an ascendancy in the Near East which threatened British interests in the Mediterranean and India, then the Crimean War can be justified as one waged on behalf of Imperial interests. . . . So far as European politics were concerned, it was India and the position of India as a British possession that

^{4 5} *IBID*, p. 480.

dominated the situation. The whole story of our disputes and misunderstanding with Russia has its explanation in British fears of Russian intrigues and movements directed against India." ⁴⁷

"In England the sympathy with the miserable victims of Turkish misrule became modified by the re-awakened jealousy of Russian power (in Central Asia toward India)." ⁴⁸

It is generally believed that the Russo-Turkish War of 1878 was encouraged by Britain. Britain then could afford to have a war between Russia and Turkey so that she might take steps to consolidate her position in Egypt and the Suez Canal, the road to India.

"The purchase of the Khedive's share in the Suez Canal Company (1875) was the first fruit of the new imperialism... Disraeli assumed a serious responsibility in refusing his assent to the Berlin Memorandum of May, 1876, the object of which was to impose certain reforms on Turkey, to be carried out under European supervision.... The Berlin Memorandum in its origin was the work of three empires; but France and Italy adhered to it; and doubtless Great Britain, refusing, helped to stiffen the backs of the Turks and thus

⁴⁷ EGERTON, H. E : *British Foreign Policy in Europe*, pp, 359-361,

⁴⁸ MORLEY, JOHN : *The Life of Gladstone*, Vol, III, p, 569.

to make more probable the outbreak of the war."⁴⁹

In 1876 Gladstone was advocating the sending of a British navy against the Porte, but when in 1873 the Russians were near Constantinople, Britain voted a credit of six million pounds and sent the navy to the Dardanelles as a threat against Russia.

"The last word of the Eastern Question," as Lord Derby said in those days, "is this: 'Who is to have Constantinople?' No great Power would be willing to see it in the hands of any other great Power, no small Power could hold it at all, and as for joint occupation, all such expedients are both dangerous and doubtful."⁵⁰

At the Congress of Berlin, Britain assumed the role of preserving the peace of Europe, but her real interests were guarded through secret treaties both with Russia and Turkey, securing greater control of the Mediterranean, the route to India through the Suez Canal and the lessening of Turkish prestige in Asia.

"Besides the secret agreement with Russia (which agreed to Russian influence up to Nor-

⁴⁹ EGERTON, H. E.: *British Foreign Policy in Europe*, pp, 312-313.

⁵⁰ MORLEY, JOHN: *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, Vol. II, p, 572.

thern Bulgaria', the British Government had made a secret convention with Turkey. By this convention England undertook to defend Turkey against Russian aggression in Asia, though concessions were made to Russia that rendered Asiatic Turkey indefensible; and Turkey was to carry out reforms which all sensible men knew to be wholly beyond her power. In payment of this bargain, the Sultan allowed England to occupy and administer Cyprus."⁵¹

The object and the nature of the secret agreement has been characterized as: "A proceeding by which we (the British) had undertaken, behind the back of Europe and against the Treaty of Paris, to establish a sole protectorate in Asiatic Turkey."⁵²

After Britain completed her control of the Suez Canal and the occupation of Egypt (so necessary for controlling India), her antipathy against Turkey began to increase.

"Just averse to a joint occupation of Egypt by England and France, as the most perilous of all courses, the London cabinet [Gladstone about 1881] looked to the Sultan as the best instrument for restoring order. Here they were confronted

⁵¹ MORLEY, JOHN: *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, Vol. II, pp, 575-576,

⁵² IBID., p.577.

by two insurmountable obstacles : first, the steadfast hostility of France to any form of Turkish intervention and, second, that strong current of antipathy to the Sultan which had been set flowing over British opinion in the days of Midlothian.”⁵³

Against this policy of making Asiatic Turkey a British protectorate, the Sultan Abdul Hamid started his Pan-Islamic agitation. He also favoured the Germans with railroad concessions for the Berlin-Bagdad railroad in opposition to the British railroad scheme from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf. This conflict of interests between Britain and Turkey was due to the fact that a rejuvenated Turkey would be a source of trouble for Britain in Egypt and India. So when the Young Turk revolution broke out, Austria broke the Treaty of Berlin by annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina. Britain did not support Turkey in any effective way. Then when the Tripolitan War broke out and Italy annexed Tripoli, Britain supported Italy, hoping to detach the latter from the Triple Alliance by this support and other considerations. Turkey entered the World War against the Triple Entente because she felt that the Anglo-Russian Entente solved the question of Indian

⁵³ *IBID.*, III, p. 74.

curity while the Anglo-French Entente settled the Egyptian and Moroccan problems. Under the circumstances, allied victory stood for Turkish dismemberment. The destruction of Turkey was an asset to the British sovereignty in India provided Russia or any other power would not control Constantinople. The present [November, 22] British efforts to control Constantinople and the Dardanelles is due to her efforts to make the Mediterranean a British lake and to have absolute control of the Indian route.

While the British efforts were directed toward the political weakening of Turkey, in India the question of Turkey has become a part of national agitation. The Khilafat Question and the present Anglo-Turkish discord over the Dardanelles, have been summed up by Prof. Ferdinand Schevill in his monumental work, "The Balkan Peninsula," in the following way :

"For centuries the apple of discord among the ambitious peoples of the earth, and without question the chief prize of the war, the fair city on the Golden Horn, was esteemed as an invaluable treasure by all three victors (Britain, France, and Italy). Simply because there was no other way out, they at last agreed to set off the city itself, the waters of the Straits, and a narrow

strip of shore on either side of the channel, as an international zone under their combined control. Both in peace and war the water-passage was to remain open to the merchantmen and the Warships of every nation of the earth. While these pronouncements set forth the great principle of a united world and have an equitable ring, it is plain that the international regime must, in the event of war, redound to the advantage of Great Britain since by reason of its naval superiority Great Britain can in any crisis always drive its rivals from the sea. In the light of past experience there is no room for doubt that, when the next war comes, Great Britain will be found using the straits and that, besides herself, no power not on her side and not enjoying her patronage will share this decisive advantage. For this reason the international zone of the Straits is a British solution of the Constantinopolitan problem and neither France nor Italy would have accepted it, if they could have discovered any other way out of the tangle. More particularly France has so little stomach for the settlement that it was no sooner agreed on than the Paris Government, first by secret intrigues and latterly by open negotiations, has attempted to supersede and nullify it by restoring the power of the Sultan. Rather than

have the British at Constantinople the French are prepared to scrap the whole Treaty of Sevres." ⁵⁴

Since the defeat of the Greeks by Turkey, and because none of the three Great Powers wants to have the control of the Straits and Constantinople by any one of them, they have agreed that Constantinople and part of Thrace would go back to Turkey. It is quite conceivable that Britain would do her best to win Turkey to her side in the proposed Lausanne Conference, siding with Turkish ambitions, so that French influence be not increasing in the Orient through Franco-Turkish, Franco-Turkish-Italian, or Franco-Turkish-Italian-Russian understandings against Britain, controlling the Mediterranean. Suppose that Anglo-Turkish understanding be a necessity for the maintenance of Britain's position in the Orient and India, and so for the best interests of the Ottoman Empire—there is not the least doubt about a compromise leading to an Anglo-Turkish Entente. In that case what will be the attitude of Turkey regarding India? It is not conceivable that Turkey will go to the aid of India against Britain. In practical

⁵⁴ SCHEVILL, FERDINAND: *The Balkan Peninsula and the Near East* (1922), pp. 528-529.

politics the interest of the state dominates and there is very little consideration for philanthropy at the cost of a state.

While the British efforts were directed towards the weakening of Turkey, in India the question of Turkey has become a part of national agitation. The Khilafat Question and the movement against dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire were made the issues in Indian agitation against England. At the outset it had some religious significance for the seventy millions of Mohammedans of India anxious to aid their co-religionists in Turkey. But the movement is being supported by the Hindus as well, under the leadership of Gandhi, on account of Britain's breach of faith to the Indian people who fought for Britain and defeated Turkey in the World War.

From the broad point of view of world politics the people of India are justified in aiding Turkey, so that Britain may not relegate such a strategic nation as Turkey into a position of absolute insignificance. But if Indian Mohammedans and Hindus are influenced in aiding Turkey by mere religious sentiment and hatred against Britain, then it is rather dangerous and detrimental to India's own national interest. India's primary interest is the question of

national independence and not religious fanaticism or racial antagonism. In the past Turkey has been the friend of Britain and if that suits her interests again, then she may make an alliance with Britain and influence the religious prejudice of Indian Mohammedans towards supporting Britain as an ally of Turkey. Then again, unless India becomes free and independent she cannot aid Turkey or any other nation to the best of her ability. To the Indian Mohammedans and nationalists, who put greater importance on the Khilafat issue than the question of Indian independence, I wish to tell what Enver Pasha, as the Minister of War of the Ottoman Empire told me :

“The best way an Indian can aid Turkey and the world is by concentrating all efforts on the freedom of India, because without a free India it will be hard for Turkey to maintain her national independence. Above all, every Indian Mohammedan should learn that they have to co-operate with the Hindus as Indians, and that religious fanaticism must be banished from the field of national and international politics, unless the world is to go back to the darkness of the Middle Ages.”

This advice of Enver Pasha should be heeded

ANGLO-TURKISH RELATIONS AND INDIA

not only by the people of India but all the non-Christian peoples struggling to attain their independence.

Plainly, Indian international policy must be based upon national interest for the sake of international peace.

ANGLO-TURKISH RELATIONS AND INDIA

not only by the people of India but all the non-Christian peoples struggling to attain their independence.

Plainly, Indian international policy must be based upon national interest for the sake of international peace.

CHAPTER SIX

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE SUEZ CANAL

BRITISH control of the Suez Canal is one of the cardinal principles of her world policies. This policy is based upon the formula of preservation of the Empire. On the same ground, when the French initiative was aiding the Khedive of Egypt to build the canal, Britain opposed it lest it would be controlled by another nation than herself.

“For fifteen years the British Government had used its influence at Constantinople to prevent the Sultan from sanctioning the project (construction of the Suez Canal under French influence). In June, 1858, a motion of protest was made in the House of Commons. Lord Palmerston persisted that the scheme was the greatest bubble that was ever imposed upon the credulity and simplicity of the people of this country [England]; the public meetings on its behalf were got up by a pack of foreign projec

tors ; traffic by railway would always beat traffic by steamer through the Canal ; it would be a step towards the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire ; it would tend to dismember our own empire by opening a passage between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, which would be at the command of other nations and not at our. Away, then, with such a sacrifice of the interests of Great Britain to philanthropic schemes and philosophic reveries.”^{5 5}

After 1870 the rivalry between British and French colonial ambitions centred chiefly around the question of domination in Africa. The interest of France in the trade with the Levant and her protectorate in Algeria made her keenly sensitive to anything that related to the North African seaboard. In 1875, Great Britain secured a dominant position in this region through the purchase of shares in the Suez Canal Company. There is no doubt that in this negotiation Disraeli had in mind the prospect of uniting India more closely to England.

Gladstone, describing in 1877 the British Government's position in this matter, stated that the first and fundamental proposition was the preservation of British dominion in the East, and that

^{5 5} MORLEY, JOHN: *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, Vol. I, pp. 591-2.

this was only less important than the preservation of British national independence. He pointed out the following factors which threatened British control of the Mediterranean route to India: "The bare possibility of Russia's obtaining the command of the Bosphorus makes it a matter of urgent necessity that we should secure our route to India ... the route of which we must be masters, is the route of the Suez Canal.....It is held that the Canal must be kept open to our ships at all times and under all circumstances.....the command of the Canal involves the occupation of the delta of the Nile. This is called in some passages, the occupation of Egypt." 66

In 1880 an English writer, the Hon. Mr. Cowen, in considering the relation of the Suez Canal to India, wrote: "The Suez Canal is the link which unites our eastern and western empires. Through it we not only reach India but our dependencies in the Chinese Seas, our Australian colonies, the Mauritius, and the British settlements on the east coast of Africa. It is the neck which connects the head with the extremities of the empire.....We have got the Canal, and in the interest of ourselves and the world we will keep it free from every one at all hazards. If Russia

66 GLADSTONE, WILLIAM E. *Aggression on Egypt and Freedom in the East*. Originally published in 19th Century, 1877.

was to obtain political supremacy on either side of the Bosphorus she would stop the Canal or intercept our way to India by the Euphrates valley.....This position is the key to Europe—and one of its arteries. Its occupation by conquering ambitions and despotic power would be a danger to England, to Europe and to Liberty.”⁵⁷

Dr. Geffcken says regarding the value of this route: “There can be no doubt that India forms the most vital point in the British Empire beyond the sea; consequently the whole energy of the British statesmen ought to be directed, on the one hand, to securing the north-west frontier threatened by Russia, and on the other, to keeping the way clear from England to the Peninsula of the Ganges. In former times England grasped in a masterly way the necessity of obtaining solid pillars on which this road is built.....Down to the cutting of the Isthmus of the Suez, the only road to India was that around the Cape.”⁵⁸

The great naval authority, Admiral Mahan, summarized the strategic value of Egypt to the British Empire in the following words: “In military situation, Egypt approaches an ideal; for to a local concentration of forces, defensive and

⁵⁷ COWEN: *Foreign Policy of England*, p. 9.

⁵⁸ GEFFECKEN: *The British Empire*, pp. 66-67.

offensive, operative in two directions toward Gibraltar or towards India, it adds several streams of supply, so diverse in origin that no one navy can take position to intercept them all.If the Mediterranean be blocked, the Red Sea remains always the shortest route to India.....The true solution for a state already holding Malta and Gibraltar would seem to be to grasp Egypt firmly to consolidate local tenure there, and to establish in India, Australia and the Cape sources of necessary supply—whether manufactories or depots—in ammunitions and stores, against the chance of temporary interruption on the side of England.”

In the concluding paragraph of his book, “The Sea Road to the East,” A. C. Sargeant writes: “We have approached India from the north-west by the passages of the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal; and we have seen how our interests in the Mediterranean, at first purely Egyptian have become more and more related to the control of the seaway to India. South-west is the older route by the way of the Atlantic and the Cape, route still valuable for some purposes. There the control of the route leads us to the occupation of the neighbouring mainland of Africa. South-east again we reach Australia, either direct across the ocean, or threading the island group

⁵⁹ MAHAN, ADMIRAL A. T.: *The Problem of Asia*, 1900, p.

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE SUEZ CANAL

Malays; while the Indian Ocean has its own system of minor local routes. So we have the lines of traffic from every part of the world converging on the Indian region, with its vast trade and swarming population; the natural junction of all these sea roads, great and small, is Colombo close to the mainland of the Peninsula, yet at the same time well out in the sea, the centre of control from which India reaches out in every direction and dominates the Indian Ocean.”⁶⁰

In his work, “Seaways of the Empire,” Mr. Sargeant writes: “The Suez Canal is an important factor in the Australian traffic while the movement through it to and from the East and South Africa must not be entirely neglected. For the rest of the traffic between Europe, the Indian Ocean and the whole seaboard of Eastern Asia, the Canal is the only route which we need consider.”⁶¹

The important relation of the Canal as the link between Europe and Asia is beyond doubt. The master of that route is to a large extent master of the political relations between Europe and Asia. Thus it is that to-day Great Britain is a great Asiatic power. The rise of nationalist

⁶⁰ SARGEANT, A. C.: *Sea Road to the East*, p. 115.

⁶¹ SARGEANT, A. C.: *Seaways of the Empire*, p. 45.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

sentiment in Egypt has affected Great Britain's tenure (in Egypt), which she consolidated in 1882, but to-day, while she is willing to make concessions to Egypt, she is determined to keep control of the Canal, for purposes of imperial communication, and to safeguard India.

The occupation of Egypt gives a vivid illustration of the fact that all political parties—liberals, conservatives, radicals—are in accord to extend British imperialism.

“.....because Egypt was on the road to India British statesmen were bound to recognize the special claims of Egypt upon their attention and care. If Tory imperialism first bought his shares in the Suez Canal Company from the Khedive, it was liberals of the type of Lord Granville and Gladstone who found themselves compelled most reluctantly to maintain a virtual protectorate over Egypt. There is here no ground for party recriminations..... But since an Egypt secure from domestic or foreign intrigue was a necessity for British India, British statesmen proceeded gloomily and reluctantly with their inevitable work.”⁶²

Blunt in his “Secret History of the Occupation of Egypt” and in his “Diaries” has proved beyond doubt that Britain wanted to control

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE SUEZ CANAL

Egypt for her world imperialism centred in India. Establishment of British protectorate in Egypt sanctioned by the Treaty of Versailles and particularly the United States of America was the natural outcome of the British traditional policy of expansion in violation of agreements, if that be the interest of Great Britain to do.

To pacify the Egyptian people in their revolt against Britain, she has made concessions. But Egyptian independence, under the present situation, is a myth. Britain controls under the present arrangement the finance, army and foreign relations of Egypt. Egypt will never secure her true independence, and Britain will use the might of her empire against Egypt to keep her within the fold, as long as India remains a part of the British Empire. Thus the fate of Egypt is inseparably connected with that of India. Any movement that loosens the hold of Britain in India is a direct aid to Egypt, and the Egyptian nationalists of the Zaglul Pasha type fully realize it; and thus they promise complete co-operation with India on the national basis and not on a religious basis. India should help Egypt to be free because India has helped Britain to subject Egypt, and even to-day Indian soldiers are in Egypt to

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

preserve British interests there ; but let this be understood, that Indo-Egyptian understanding is not, and must under no circumstances be, based on religious fanaticism or co-operation of Indians as love for Islam.

CHAPTER SEVEN.

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE PERSIAN GULF

No better statement of British policy in Persia can be made than that contained in a despatch from the Government of India to the Secretary of State for India, in Council, dated September, 1899. ".....The strategical interests of Great Britain in Persia arise from conditions with which India is most intimately concerned. Long before the boundaries of British India extended to their present limits, or before Russia had become a great Central Asian Power approaching or impinging upon many points on the Indian frontiers, the fortunes of Persia, though at that time not a contentious country, had become a matter of vital concern to the British dominion in India. In the early years of the present century, when the ambitions of France were the main sources of apprehension, it was through Persia that a blow at British superemacy was expected to be struck,

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE PERSIAN GULF

and that an invasion of India was planned. The same idea has reappeared at intervals since. Now that the boundaries of Afghanistan, which have been demarcated and guaranteed by Great Britain, march for many hundreds of miles with those of Persia; that Persian territory is also conterminous for hundreds of miles with Baluchistan, a state under a British protectorate and in large measure actually administered by the officers of the Government of India; and that the sea, that washes the southern coasts of Persia is one in which, both from its proximity to the Indian Ocean and as a result of the exertions of the past century, Indian interests and influence have become supreme—it is clear that Persia has assumed a strategical importance, in relation to British India, which might not be serious were the resources or the designs of that country itself alone to be considered; which is indisputably great, when it is remembered that closely pressing upon Persia and Afghanistan is the ever-growing momentum of a power whose interests in Asia are not always in accord with our own, and that the Persian Gulf is beginning to attract the interest of the other and sometimes rival nations. These conditions, however, while they indicate the supreme concern which those

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE PERSIAN GULF

who are responsible for the government of India cannot fail to feel in the fortunes of Persia, are nevertheless sufficiently obvious in their general application to render it unnecessary for us to point out their far more than local range, or to argue that they affect not merely the destinies of British dominion in India, but those of the British Empire..... Whilst it may be presumed that these pledges [Russian pledges for the integrity of Persia] so frequently renewed, are still in existence, we are not of the opinion that they are in themselves quite sufficient to arrest the centripetal progress of Russian influence in Persia or to save the Persian kingdom or British interests in it from the erosive agencies that we have described. Within the limits of nominally still existing integrity and independence many encroachments upon both these attributes are possible so that by almost imperceptible degrees, they pass into the realm of constitutional fiction, where they continue to provide an exercise for the speculations of the jurists long after they have been contemptuously ignored by statesmen..... Neither will it be overlooked by Her Majesty's Government, that, while such engagement with Russia might preclude that Power from obtaining control over Central

and Southern Persia and in that way reach the Persian Gulf, it would not for one moment retard, might, on the contrary, accelerate, the advance to the same objective through Mesopotamia by way of Bagdad.....We should strongly deprecate the political rivalry of any European Power in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf, even though such a situation while fraught with constant annoyance, might not, as in the case of Russia, constitute a positive menace to the Indian Empire." 63

Valentine Chirol, in the preface to his valuable work, "The Middle Eastern Question or Some Political Problems of Indian Defence," relates that he was impressed while journeying through Persia in 1902—3, with the rapidity with which events were moving in the "immutable East." "Under the impact of western forces," he writes, "the disintegration of Asia is proceeding apace, and new conditions are being evolved which, within a period perhaps no longer very remote, will seriously affect and both directly and indirectly the position of our Indian Empire." 64

63 *British Blue Book, Persia, No. 1, 1908.*

64 CHIROL, VALENTINE: *The Middle Eastern Question or Some Political Problems of Indian Defence*, p. 5.

Throughout the nineteenth century Persia had a threefold interest for England, due to the intrinsic importance of her position as great Asiatic power, to her potentiality as a valuable ally in case of attack against India, and to the value of the Persian trade, which was largely an Anglo-Indian trade, and therefore intimately connected with interests of British India. Persia dominated geographically the "Middle East," those regions in Asia which extended to the borders of India or command the approaches to India. Chirol, in commenting on the Middle Eastern Question said that it is itself only a part of a much larger question upon which the future of Asia depends. "It is a continuation of the same question with which we have long been familiar in the Near East. It is closely connected with the more novel development of international rivalry in the Far East. It is the outcome of that constant projection of European forces—moral, commercial, and military—into Asia, which is slowly but steadily transforming all the conditions that enabled us to achieve, and so far to retain, as the masters of India, a position of unparalleled ascendancy in the Asiatic Continent."

⁶⁵ CHIROL, VALENTINE : *The Middle Eastern Question or Some Political Problems of Indian Defence*, p. 5

Referring to Russia's influence in Persia Chirol writes at this period (1903): "That question is whether Asia is really a field in which there is room for two of the greatest European powers to fulfil their peaceful mission in friendly competition, or whether their rivalry must ultimately degenerate into a struggle for exclusive mastery." ⁶⁶

He comments further: "But it is necessary also to recognize that the extension of her [Russia's] power has already seriously affected the position of our Indian Empire, and that its further extension might have still graver results. Without going back further than the last two decades, it is obviously the rapid growth of Russia's power in Asia which has alone compelled India to carry out a vast and costly scheme of defensive armaments on her north-west frontier." ⁶⁷

The solution advanced by Sir Valentia Chirol is as follows: "To restore the balance of power in Persia is a practical policy and it is not yet too late to prosecute it with success. But it can be prosecuted with success only by concentrating our efforts within well defined

⁶⁶ IBID., p. 18.

⁶⁷ IBID., p. 290.

limits.....Our commercial and political base is the Persian Gulf. Both politically and commercially it is of the utmost urgency that we should open up roads from our base into the interior.” ⁶⁸

In his concluding chapter, this keen student of Eastern affairs asks, “How is the position we were able to acquire, and have hitherto held in Asia, by our control of the sea to be upheld under new conditions, in which land-power is tending to become a factor only less essential to its retention than sea-power? India is, and must remain, the key of that position. More than that; it has grown to be, if not the cornerstone of the British Empire, at least one of the chief bases of its security.” ⁶⁹

Advocating a vigorous policy in Persia for the protection of British interests in India, he says: “Within the regions where we have no very important material interests to guard, and where the ascendancy of a great military power need not immediately or appreciably react upon the safety of India, we are certainly not called upon to be more Persian than the Persians, or to adopt an attitude of gratuitous opposition to

⁶⁸ CHIBOL, pp. 304-5.

⁶⁹ IBID., p. 394.

CHAPTER ONE

INDIA AND THE GROWTH OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

COBDEN, addressing the British House of Commons on June 27, 1853, said : "The English race can never become indigenous to India ; we must govern it, if we govern it at all, by means of a succession of transient visits ; and I do not think it is for the interest of the English people, any more than it is for the people of India, that we should govern them permanently. ... I see no benefit which can arise to the mass of the English people from their connection with India, except that which may arise from honest trade." ¹

The Indian people realize ever more clearly the truth of this statement. Modern British statesmanship appears blind to it, however, and is working strenuously to stave off the day when India will free herself from British Imperialism. Indian statesmen, even the most moderate, appreciate that the time will come when India will

¹ JONES, EDGAR R. : *Selected Speeches on British Foreign Policy, 1738-1914*, p. 508.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

assert her independence. Still, the leaders of this school minimize—some of them ignore—the importance of establishing foreign relations with nations abroad while carrying on the struggle for independence at home. It is true that home work will play the most important part in freeing India from the foreign yoke, but India cannot remain unmindful of the need of establishing direct foreign relations with other nations.

India's dominant geographical position, her resources, her commerce, her culture must inevitably compel her to be a part of the world movement. William H. Seward remarked: "European thought, European commerce, and European enterprise, although actually gaining in force, and European connections, although becoming more and more intimate, will nevertheless relatively sink in importance in the future, while the Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and adjacent territories will become the chief theatre of human events and activities in the world's great hereafter." And the years following the conclusion of the World War have made increasingly evident the wisdom of these words of America's great Secretary of State.

It has been through India that Asia has been involved in the intrigues of European diplomacy. British foreign policy during the last three cen-

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

assert her independence. Still, the leaders of this school minimize—some of them ignore—the importance of establishing foreign relations with nations abroad while carrying on the struggle for independence at home. It is true that home work will play the most important part in freeing India from the foreign yoke, but India cannot remain unmindful of the need of establishing direct foreign relations with other nations.

India's dominant geographical position, her resources, her commerce, her culture must inevitably compel her to be a part of the world movement. William H. Seward remarked: "European thought, European commerce, and European enterprise, although actually gaining in force, and European connections, although becoming more and more intimate, will nevertheless relatively sink in importance in the future, while the Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and adjacent territories will become the chief theatre of human events and activities in the world's great hereafter." And the years following the conclusion of the World War have made increasingly evident the wisdom of these words of America's great Secretary of State.

It has been through India that Asia has been involved in the intrigues of European diplomacy. British foreign policy during the last three cen-

turies has been greatly influenced by its strong determination to control India, because control of India is necessary for the maintenance of British supremacy in Europe and in Asia, and in world politics generally.

There are still those in India who depend upon British liberals and British labor to do justice to the people of India. This is a vain hope. Whatever of democracy has been gained by the English people in respect to suffrage and personal rights, its influence does not extend to the foreign office nor govern Britain's foreign policy. British liberals and British labor do not dream of giving up any part of the Empire. In this respect there is practically no division of opinion between different groups in England. The spirit which animates British foreign policy is the preservation and expansion of the Empire: "Nothing changes in the character and view of our [British] foreign policy. We seek to be at peace everywhere and to make acquisitions without war, always keeping ourselves on the defensive; we place no faith in the friendships of those whose interests do not accord with our own, and we lose no opportunity of injuring them, without ostensibly violating treaties."²

² CARGILL, WILLIAM: *Foreign Affairs of Great Britain Administered by Palmerston*, p. 27, ff.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

England's interest is concentrated on sea power. General Homer Lea quotes the words of the Marquis of Salisbury to prove that the power of British Imperialism is dependent on her control of the sea: "There have been great colonial and maritime powers, four or five, but they have always fallen. . . . If we ever allow our defences at sea to fall to such a point of inefficiency that it is as easy, or nearly as easy, to cross the sea as it is to cross a land frontier, our great empire, stretching to the ends of the earth, supported by maritime force in every part of it, will come clattering to the ground when a blow at the metropolis of England is struck."

Britain can never give up the control of India.

"India may in fact be regarded as the centre or pivot of Britain's Empire in the East; and for this reason alone, setting aside all other considerations, must be defended against foreign aggressions. It is not only British supremacy in that country itself which is at stake; the uninterrupted intercourse with her eastern colonies themselves would at once be threatened, should foreign invasion take place." ⁴

India therefore is a necessity to England's

¹LEA, HOMER: *The Valor of Ignorance*, p. 119

⁴COLQUHOUN, SIR ARCHIBALD: *Russia Against India*, page 203

imperial system and naval communication. The salient points in the development of British sea power have been admirably summarized by Arthur Jose. Drawing an analogy between the Roman and British Empires he says: "The Romans, planting themselves in settlements over the lands they subdued, bound these outposts of their Empire together with great highroads, and guarded the roads with forts at every crossing. . . ." Just so to-day the British Empire is bound together with our ocean highways, and those ways are guarded from end to end not only by the settlements they thread, but the military stations and stations that, though they have now grown into industrial communities, were first and are primarily of military importance.

"As usual, we began with no definite plans, and it was the French who first taught us the strategic value of these intermediate seaports. But some of them we had obtained for other reasons. St. Helena had thus in 1651 become our half-way house on the Cape route to India; and Gibraltar was seized in 1734 that we might keep free to our trade the gate of the Mediterranean. Presently the raids of Anson on Spain's South American colonies suggested the utility of procuring another half-way house on our warships'

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

route to the Pacific ; and when the Seven Years' War was over we annexed and partially occupied the Falkland Islands. But now France, sore with the loss of Canada and India, bethought her of the revenge offered by a privateering war—a *guerre de course*, such as the French navy still dreams of—and by the way of preparation marked down the harbours from which our East Indian trade could be most easily attacked. We did not come so well out of the American War as to stop her from proceeding with these plans; but the great war—Revolutionary and Napoleonic—was decisive enough to give British Ministers whatever they chose to take. It had been long enough, too, to disclose fully the whole scheme by which our greatest enemy hoped to destroy our Empire. Napoleon harrassed our Indian convoys from the Mauritius; but his hope had been to create for our destruction a French route to India, either by Egypt and the Red Sea, or, later, by some overland route to Persia and the Gulf. On the lines he thus made clear, it became our policy to establish a sure defence, either making the new roads or east blocking their entrances and exits. The policy has been carried out spasmodically, it is true; there have been intervals when it seemed to be reversed, years when it was well-nigh reversed;

but that way the current has tended, and its results are clear on the map to-day.

"For these are the great ocean-roads of trade: Firstly, those that run east and west across the North Atlantic and North Pacific, free along their whole length from possible hostile land. On these it is as much as we can hope to hold fortified posts at either end: in the Atlantic our British and Canadian ports (and the Bermudas), in the North Pacific Esquimaux on Vancouver Island and Hong Kong. Secondly, those that connect Europe eastwardly with Southern Asia—the Cape route, the Red Sea route, and that by the Persian Gulf. We guard our Cape route with the watch-ports at Gibraltar and Freetown and Simon's Bay, and the stations at St. Helena and Ascension (occupied in 1815), while the tiny settlement on Tristan da Cunha prevents any inimical use of it in anticipation of war. In the Indian Ocean Mauritius and its dependencies, Rodriguez (1809), the Seychelles (1794), the Chagos and Amirante groups and their many smaller neighbors, prolong our line to Ceylon, and it is extended past Further India to North China by the Straits Settlements, Labuan, Hong Kong, and Wei-hai-wei. Gibraltar, Malta (1800), and Cyprus (1878), protect the Mediterranean road: Aden and Perim (1857) watch the Red Sea mouth

which is further secured by British protectorates over northern Somaliland (1884-6) and Socotra (1886). The Persian Gulf is blocked by our station at Bahrein (1867) well within our agency at Muscat, and our ownership of the Baluchistan coast.

"A third series of trade-routes brings to us the commerce of South America, from both its eastern and its western parts, and most of the sailing-ships that carry Australian wares. On this we have no harbour of our own but the Falklands. But its possible supplanter, the highway that may soon be opened through the Caribbean Sea and Nicaragua and the tropical Pacific, is well guarded for us: though the German flag flies in Samoa, and the French over the eastern groups—Marquesas, Society, and their neighbors—nearly all the other groups are ours, Fiji and Tonga and Hervey, Gilbert and Ellice, and southern Melanesia; watched and counted not only by the men of our new Commonwealth in those seas, but by their fellow-islanders of New Zealand, who hope still, as Grey taught them to be the headquarters of a Polynesian confederacy under the Imperial flag." ⁵

In this expansion, India has been the central motive. As Mr. Jose puts it: "To reach India

⁵ JOSE, ARTHUR: *The Growth of the Empire*, pp. 394-397.

our adventurers threw themselves upon America; to guard the Indian trade we seized South Africa; upon India converge the routes that are dotted from end to end with our forts and coaling stations. And the struggle for India has been a struggle against France. From France we took Canada; just, and only just ahead of France we secured Australasia; it was for fear of France that we deprived Holland of the Cape Colony."

As pointed out by General Lea, British dominion consists of one-fourth of the land surface, and the suzerainty of the Five Seas. He comments, "It is over this seventeen-twentieths of the world that broods the jealous yet anxious scowl of the Saxon race. That British rule should, in various degrees of sovereignty, exercise its dominion over seventeen-twentieths of the world's surface is significant of just that degree of repression toward all other nations, their rights and expansion by land or by sea." ⁶

It is only necessary to visualize the gains made by the British Empire in Asia and Africa and in Pacific waters through the World War in order to appreciate the significance of the following paragraph by the same authority.

"It is not so much in the vastness of British possessions that are found conditions provocative

⁶ LEA, HOMER: *The Day of the Saxon*, p. 15.

of war as it is in its geographical distribution. It is not a segregated sovereignty occupying, as the Russian Empire, a corner or contiguous portion of the earth, but forms, on the other hand, a circle around the entire globe, within which are placed all the other powers of the world; and not one of them can follow their lines of natural expansion without, sooner or later, being brought into direct contact with the British Dominion." ⁷

In the opinion of General Lea, there are but three countries that possess pre-eminent strategic positions: The British Islands, the Japanese Islands, and India.

"The Indian Empire is in the strategic centre of the third most important portion of the globe. Its influence has had its effect upon the European mind from the earliest times; and in the future the power of its strategic position as a determinate factor in world politics will increase with each international readjustment." ⁸

Lord Curzon says: "But her control and commanding position is nowhere better seen than in the political influence which she exercises over the destinies of her neighbors near and far and the extent to which their fortunes revolve upon an Indian axis. *The independence of Afghan-*

⁷ IBID., p. 16.

⁸ IBID., p. 63.

istan, the continued national existence of Persia, the maintainance of Turkish rule at Bagdad, are one and all dependent upon Calcutta. Nay, the radiating circle of her influence overlaps the adjoining continents, and affects alike the fate of the Bosphorus and the destinies of Egypt. Nor is the effect less remarkable if examined upon the eastern side.

.....It is from jealousy of India and to impair the position which India gives to Britain in the Far East, France has again embarked upon an Asiatic career, and is advancing from the south-east with steps that faithfully correspond with those of Russia upon the north-west. The heritage of the Indian Empire has within the last ten years made us the land neighbors of China, and has multiplied threefold the area of our diplomacy at Peking. Even the fortunes of remote Korea are in a manner bound up with the politics of Hindustan, seeing that it is by the same foe (Russia) that, in the last resort, both are threatened, and that the tactics which aim at appropriation of the smaller units have as their ulterior objective the detriment of the greater; such and so supreme is the position enjoyed in the Asian continent by the Empire of the Kaiser-i-Hind. Towards her, or into her orbit, a centripetal force, which none appears able to resist, draws every wandering star. Just as Europe

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

turns upon the dismemberment of Turkey, so the Eastern question in Asia turns upon the continued solidarity of Hindustan.”³

Lord Curzon, as the Viceroy of India, in a speech delivered in the India Council on March 25, 1903, makes it clear that India is the centre of British world policies, particularly Asia :

“Our Indian dominions more directly touch those of Turkey and in many parts of the Arabian peninsula, those of Russia on the Pamirs, those of China along the borders of Turkestan, and Yunnan, those of France on the upper Mekong. In our dealings with them the Foreign Department in India is becoming the Asiatic branch of the Foreign in England ... The geographical position of India will more and more push her into the forefront of international politics, she will more and more become the strategical frontier of the British Empire.”

While speaking before the London Society of Pilgrims at the Savoy Hotel, Field Marshal Lord Roberts presiding, Lord Curzon on April 6, 1906, said :

“But when you remember that three out of every four of these subjects of the king are in India, that Calcutta, the capital of India, the next city in size to London in the whole British Em-

³ CURZON : *Problems of the Far East*, pp. 8-9.

pire, that with the possible exception of China, India is the largest and most populous political aggregation in the universe, then I think you will begin to realise to what extent the British Empire is an Asiatic Empire, and how, if we cut out the Asiatic portion of it, it would infallibly dwindle in scale and importance. I sometimes like to picture to myself this great Imperial fabric as a huge structure, like some Tennysonian 'Palace of Art' of which the foundations are in this country [England], where they have been laid and must be maintained by British hands, but of which the colonies are the pillars and then high above all floats the vastness of an Asiatic dome." ¹⁰

It is the motive of expansion of the Empire of Britain that has caused wars during the past centuries and this motive is threatening the world peace to-day. India forms the centre of this Imperial system and Britain keeps India under subjection to maintain her dominant imperial position all over the world.

¹⁰ CURZON : *Subjects of the Day*, p. 28.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

"Whatever the future may bring forth to this country [England]," he writes, "it cannot fail to be a matter of capital importance, seeing that the Empire of Great Britain, though a European, a Canadian and Australian, is before all else an Asiatic Dominion. We still are, and have it in our hands to remain, the First Power in the East. Just as De Tocqueville remarked that the conquest and government of India are really the achievements which have given England her place in the opinion of the world, so it is the prestige and the wealth arising from her Asiatic position that are the foundation-stones of the British Empire." ²⁰

²⁰ BURROWS, MONTAGUE : *History of Foreign Policy of Great Britain*, p. 350.

²¹ CURZON, EARL : *Problems of the Far East*, p. 414.

CHAPTER THREE

ANGLO-RUSSIAN RELATIONS ON THE INDIAN FRONTIER

PROFESSOR HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS, in referring to the influence of India upon England's foreign relations, says, "None can understand the foreign policy of Great Britain, which has inspired military and diplomatic activities from the Napoleonic Wars to the present day, who does not interpret wars, diplomatic conflicts, treaties and alliances, territorial annexations, extensions of protectorates, with the fact of India constantly in mind." ²²

The advent of Russia on the Indian frontier after the French danger had paled and vanished is described by Arthur Jose, in a graphic manner: "and then from the landward, across the deserts and the mountain ranges of our north-eastern frontier, loomed up the shadow of a more gigantic rival, of whom little was

²² GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS : *The New Map of Asia*, p. 4.

CHAPTER SIX

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE SUEZ CANAL

BRITISH control of the Suez Canal is one of the cardinal principles of her world policies. This policy is based upon the formula of preservation of the Empire. On the same ground, when the French initiative was aiding the Khedive of Egypt to build the canal, Britain opposed it lest it would be controlled by another nation than herself.

“For fifteen years the British Government had used its influence at Constantinople to prevent the Sultan from sanctioning the project (construction of the Suez Canal under French influence). In June, 1858, a motion of protest was made in the House of Commons. Lord Palmerston persisted that the scheme was the greatest bubble that was ever imposed upon the credulity and simplicity of the people of this country [England]; the public meetings on its behalf were got up by a pack of foreign projec-

tors ; traffic by railway would always beat traffic by steamer through the Canal ; it would be a step towards the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire ; it would tend to dismember our own empire by opening a passage between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, which would be at the command of other nations and not at ours. Away, then, with such a sacrifice of the interest of Great Britain to philanthropic schemes and philosophic reveries.”^{5 5}

After 1870 the rivalry between British and French colonial ambitions centred chiefly around the question of domination in Africa. The interest of France in the trade with the Levant and her protectorate in Algeria made her keenly sensitive to anything that related to the North African seaboard. In 1875, Great Britain secured a dominant position in this region through the purchase of shares in the Suez Canal Company. There is no doubt that in this negotiation Disraeli had in mind the prospect of uniting India more closely to England.

Gladstone, describing in 1877 the British Government's position in this matter, stated that the first and fundamental proposition was the preservation of British dominion in the East, and the

^{5 5} MORLEY, JOHN: *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*. Vol. I, pp. 591-2.

this was only less important than the preservation of British national independence. He pointed out the following factors which threatened British control of the Mediterranean route to India: "The bare possibility of Russia's obtaining the command of the Bosphorus makes it a matter of urgent necessity that we should secure our route to India ... the route of which we must be masters, is the route of the Suez Canal.....It is held that the Canal must be kept open to our ships at all times and under all circumstances.....the command of the Canal involves the occupation of the delta of the Nile. This is called in some passages, the occupation of Egypt." ⁵⁶

In 1880 an English writer, the Hon. Mr. Cowen, in considering the relation of the Suez Canal to India, wrote: "The Suez Canal is the link which unites our eastern and western empires. Through it we not only reach India but our dependencies in the Chinese Seas, our Australian colonies, the Mauritius, and the British settlements on the east coast of Africa. It is the neck which connects the head with the extremities of the empire.....We have got the Canal, and in the interest of ourselves and the world we will keep it free from every one at all hazards. If Russia

⁵⁶ GLADSTONE, WILLIAM E. *Aggression on Egypt and Freedom in the East*. Originally published in 19th Century, 1877.

was to obtain political supremacy on either side of the Bosphorus she would stop the Canal or intercept our way to India by the Euphrates valley.....This position is the key to Europe—and one of its arteries. Its occupation by conquering ambitions and despotic power would be a danger to England, to Europe and to Liberty.”⁸⁷

Dr. Geffcken says regarding the value of this route: “There can be no doubt that India forms the most vital point in the British Empire beyond the sea; consequently the whole energy of the British statesmen ought to be directed, on the one hand, to securing the north-west frontier threatened by Russia, and on the other, to keeping the way clear from England to the Peninsula of the Ganges. In former times England grasped in a masterly way the necessity of obtaining solid pillars on which this road is built.....Down to the cutting of the Isthmus of the Suez, the only road to India was that around the Cape.”⁸⁸

The great naval authority, Admiral Mahan, summarized the strategic value of Egypt to the British Empire in the following words: “In military situation, Egypt approaches an ideal; for to a local concentration of forces, defensive and

⁸⁷ COWEN: *Foreign Policy of England*, p. 9.

⁸⁸ GEFFECKEN: *The British Empire*, pp. 66-67.

offensive, operative in two directions toward Gibraltar or towards India, it adds several streams of supply, so diverse in origin that no one navy can take position to intercept them all.If the Mediterranean be blocked, the Red Sea remains always the shortest route to India.....The truer solution for a state already holding Malta and Gibraltar would seem to be to grasp Egypt firmly to consolidate local tenure there, and to establish in India, Australia and the Cape sources of necessary supply—whether manufactories or depots—in ammunitions and stores, against the chance of temporary interruption on the side of England.”⁸³

In the concluding paragraph of his book, “The Sea Road to the East,” A. C. Sargeant writes “We have approached India from the north-west by the passages of the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal; and we have seen how our interest in the Mediterranean, at first purely Egyptian have become more and more related to the control of the seaway to India. South-west is the older route by the way of the Atlantic and the Cape, a route still valuable for some purposes. There the control of the route leads us to the occupation of the neighbouring mainland of Africa. South-east again we reach Australia, either directly across the ocean, or threading the island groups

⁸³ MAHAN, ADMIRAL A. T.: *The Problem of Asia*, 1900, p. 8

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE SUEZ CANAL

Malays; while the Indian Ocean has its own system of minor local routes. So we have the lines of traffic from every part of the world converging on the Indian region, with its vast trade and swarming population; the natural junction of all these sea roads, great and small, is Colombo close to the mainland of the Peninsula, yet at the same time well out in the sea, the centre of control from which India reaches out in every direction and dominates the Indian Ocean.”⁶⁰

In his work, “Seaways of the Empire,” Mr. Sargeant writes: “The Suez Canal is an important factor in the Australian traffic while the movement through it to and from the East and South Africa must not be entirely neglected. For the rest of the traffic between Europe, the Indian Ocean and the whole seaboard of Eastern Asia, the Canal is the only route which we need consider.”⁶¹

The important relation of the Canal as the link between Europe and Asia is beyond doubt. The master of that route is to a large extent master of the political relations between Europe and Asia. Thus it is that to-day Great Britain is a great Asiatic power. The rise of nationalist

⁶⁰ SARGEANT, A. C.: *Sea Road to the East*, p. 115.

⁶¹ SARGEANT, A. C.: *Seaways of the Empire*, p. 45.

sentiment in Egypt has affected Great Britain's tenure (in Egypt), which she consolidated in 1882, but to-day, while she is willing to make concessions to Egypt, she is determined to keep control of the Canal, for purposes of imperial communication, and to safeguard India.

The occupation of Egypt gives a vivid illustration of the fact that all political parties—liberals, conservatives, radicals—are in accord to extend British imperialism.

“.....because Egypt was on the road to India, British statesmen were bound to recognize the special claims of Egypt upon their attention, and care. If Tory imperialism first bought his shares in the Suez Canal Company from the Khedive, it was liberals of the type of Lord Granville and Gladstone who found themselves compelled most reluctantly to maintain a virtual protectorate over Egypt. There is here no ground for party recriminations..... But since an Egypt secure from domestic or foreign intrigue was a necessity for British India, British statesmen proceeded gloomily and reluctantly with their inevitable work.”⁶²

Blunt in his “Secret History of the Occupation of Egypt” and in his “Diaries” has proved beyond doubt that Britain wanted to control

⁶² H. E. EGERTON : *British Foreign Policy in Europe*, p. 361

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE SUEZ CANAL

Egypt for her world imperialism centred in India. Establishment of British protectorate in Egypt sanctioned by the Treaty of Versailles and particularly the United States of America was the natural outcome of the British traditional policy of expansion in violation of agreements, if that be the interest of Great Britain to do.

To pacify the Egyptian people in their revolt against Britain, she has made concessions. But Egyptian independence, under the present situation, is a myth. Britain controls under the present arrangement the finance, army and foreign relations of Egypt. Egypt will never secure her true independence, and Britain will use the might of her empire against Egypt to keep her within the fold, as long as India remains a part of the British Empire. Thus the fate of Egypt is inseparably connected with that of India. Any movement that loosens the hold of Britain in India is a direct aid to Egypt, and the Egyptian nationalists of the Zaglul Pasha type fully realize it; and thus they promise complete co-operation with India on the national basis and not on a religious basis. India should help Egypt to be free because India has helped Britain to subject Egypt, and even to-day Indian soldiers are in Egypt to

preserve British interests there ; but let this be understood, that Indo-Egyptian understanding is not, and must under no circumstances be based on religious fanaticism or co-operation of Indians as love for Islam.

CHAPTER SEVEN.

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE PERSIAN GULF

No better statement of British policy in Persia can be made than that contained in a despatch from the Government of India to the Secretary of State for India, in Council, dated September, 1899. ".....The strategical interests of Great Britain in Persia arise from conditions with which India is most intimately concerned. Long before the boundaries of British India extended to their present limits or before Russia had become a great Central Asian Power approaching or impinging upon many points on the Indian frontiers, the fortunes of Persia, though at that time not a contentious country, had become a matter of vital concern to the British dominion in India. In the early years of the present century, when the ambitions of France were the main sources of apprehension, it was through Persia that a blow at British superemacy was expected to be struck,

preserve British interests there ; but let this be understood, that Indo-Egyptian understanding is not, and must under no circumstances be, based on religious fanaticism or co-operation of Indians as love for Islam.

CHAPTER SEVEN.

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE PERSIAN GULF

No better statement of British policy in Persia can be made than that contained in a despatch from the Government of India to the Secretary of State for India, in Council, dated September, 1899. ".....The strategical interests of Great Britain in Persia arise from conditions with which India is most intimately concerned. Long before the boundaries of British India extended to their present limits or before Russia had become a great Central Asian Power approaching or impinging upon many points on the Indian frontiers, the fortunes of Persia, though at that time not a contentious country, had become a matter of vital concern to the British dominion in India. In the early years of the present century, when the ambitions of France were the main sources of apprehension, it was through Persia that a blow at British superemacy was expected to be struck.

and that an invasion of India was planned. The same idea has reappeared at intervals since. Now that the boundaries of Afghanistan which have been demarcated and guaranteed by Great Britain, march for many hundreds of miles with those of Persia; that Persian territory is also conterminous for hundreds of miles with Baluchistan, a state under a British protectorate and in large measure actually administered by the officers of the Government of India; and that the sea, that washes the southern coasts of Persia is one in which, both from its proximity to the Indian Ocean and as a result of the exertions of the past century Indian interests and influence have become supreme—it is clear that Persia has assumed a strategical importance, in relation to British India, which might not be serious were the resources or the designs of that country itself alone to be considered; which is indisputably great, when it is remembered that closely pressing upon Persia and Afghanistan is the ever growing momentum of a power whose interests in Asia are not always in accord with our own, and that the Persian Gulf is beginning to attract the interest of the other and sometimes rival nations. These conditions, however, while they indicate the supreme concern which those

who are responsible for the government of India cannot fail to feel in the fortunes of Persia, are nevertheless sufficiently obvious in their general application to render it unnecessary for us to point out their far more than local range, or to argue that they affect not merely the destinies of British dominion in India, but those of the British Empire..... Whilst it may be presumed that these pledges [Russian pledges for the integrity of Persia] so frequently renewed, are still in existence, we are not of the opinion that they are in themselves quite sufficient to arrest the centripetal progress of Russian influence in Persia or to save the Persian kingdom or British interests in it from the erosive agencies that we have described. Within the limits of nominally still existing integrity and independence many encroachments upon both these attributes are possible so that by almost imperceptible degrees, they pass into the realm of constitutional fiction, where they continue to provide an exercise for the speculations of the jurists long after they have been contemptuously ignored by statesmen..... Neither will it be overlooked by Her Majesty's Government, that, while such engagement with Russia might preclude that Power from obtaining control over Central

and Southern Persia and in that way reach the Persian Gulf, it would not for one moment retard, might, on the contrary, accelerate, his advance to the same objective through Mesopotamia by way of Bagdad.....We should strongly deprecate the political rivalry of any European Power in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf, even though such a situation, while fraught with constant annoyance, might not, as in the case of Russia, constitute a positive menace to the Indian Empire.”⁶³

Valentine Chirol, in the preface to his valuable work, “The Middle Eastern Question or Some Political Problems of Indian Defence,” relates that he was impressed while journeying through Persia in 1902—3, with the rapidity with which events were moving in the “immutable East.” “Under the impact of western forces,” he writes, “the disintegration of Asia is proceeding apace, and new conditions are being evolved which, within a period perhaps no longer very remote, will seriously affect and both directly and indirectly the position of our Indian Empire.”⁶⁴

⁶³ *British Blue Book*, Persia, No. 1, 1908.

⁶⁴ CHIROL, VALENTINE: *The Middle Eastern Question or Some Political Problems of Indian Defence*, p. 5.

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE PERSIAN GULF

Throughout the nineteenth century Persia had a threefold interest for England, due to the intrinsic importance of her position as great Asiatic power, to her potentiality as a valuable ally in case of attack against India, and to the value of the Persian trade, which was largely an Anglo-Indian trade, and therefore intimately connected with interests of British India. Persia dominated geographically the "Middle East," those regions in Asia which extended to the borders of India or command the approaches to India. Chirol, in commenting on the Middle Eastern Question said that it is itself only a part of a much larger question upon which the future of Asia depends. "It is a continuation of the same question with which we have long been familiar in the Near East. It is closely connected with the more novel development of international rivalry in the Far East. It is the outcome of that constant projection of European forces—moral, commercial, and military—into Asia, which is slowly but steadily transforming all the conditions that enabled us to achieve, and so far to retain, as the masters of India, a position of unparalleled ascendancy in the Asiatic Continent."

65 CHIROL, VALENTINE : *The Middle Eastern Question*
Some Political Problems of Indian Defence, p. 5

Referring to Russia's influence in Persia Chirol writes at this period (1903): "That question is whether Asia is really a field in which there is room for two of the greatest European powers to fulfil their peaceful mission in friendly competition, or whether their rivalry must ultimately degenerate into a struggle for exclusive mastery." ⁶⁶

He comments further: "But it is necessary also to recognize that the extension of her [Russia's] power has already seriously affected the position of our Indian Empire, and that its further extension might have still graver results. Without going back further than the last two decades, it is obviously the rapid growth of Russia's power in Asia which has alone compelled India to carry out a vast and costly scheme of defensive armaments on her north-west frontier." ⁶⁷

The solution advanced by Sir Valentim Chirol is as follows: "To restore the balance of power in Persia is a practical policy and it is not yet too late to prosecute it with success. But it can be prosecuted with success only by concentrating our efforts within well defined

⁶⁶ IBID., p. 18.

⁶⁷ IBID., p. 290.

limits.....Our commercial and political base is the Persian Gulf. Both politically and commercially it is of the utmost urgency that we should open up roads from our base into the interior." ⁶⁸

In his concluding chapter, this keen student of Eastern affairs asks, "How is the position we were able to acquire, and have hitherto held in Asia, by our control of the sea to be upheld under new conditions, in which land-power is tending to become a factor only less essential to its retention than sea-power? India is, and must remain, the key of that position. More than that; it has grown to be, if not the cornerstone of the British Empire, at least one of the chief bases of its security." ⁶⁹

Advocating a vigorous policy in Persia for the protection of British interests in India, he says: "Within the regions where we have no very important material interests to guard, and where the ascendancy of a great military power need not immediately or appreciably react upon the safety of India, we are certainly not called upon to be more Persian than the Persians, or to adopt an attitude of gratuitous opposition to

⁶⁸ CHIROL, pp. 304-5.

⁶⁹ IBID., p. 394.

Russia. But in the east and south of Persia, there are regions in which the presence of Russia, or, for the matter of that, if it were conceivable, the presence of any other foreign military power, would inevitably constitute a grave potential menace to the peace and security of India.....If Russia proved as reasonable as her champions anticipate, a big step would have been taken towards removing the atmosphere of suspicion which, on both sides, at present vitiates our relations with her.....The worst of all policies is the policy of drift, for those who take refuge in it invariably end by being its dupes. In China it led us into a mass of embarrassments from which we have not yet extricated ourselves, even with the help of the Japanese alliance. Where, as in Southern and Eastern Persia, the security of India is concerned it might well land us in a national catastrophe." 70

On May 5, 1903, Lord Lansdowne made the following declaration: "We, His Majesty's Government should regard the establishment of a naval base or of a fortified port in the Persian Gulf by another Power as a very grave menace to British interests, which we should certainly resist with all the means at our disposal." This

70 CHIBOL, *Ibid.*, p. 308.

THE APPROACHES TO INDIA—THE PERSIAN GULF

policy has been confirmed by Sir Edward Grey and later British Foreign Ministers." ⁷¹

The British policy towards the Persian Gulf has been to make it a British lake :

"The disadvantages to Britain in allowing a Russian absorption of Persia are obvious. India would be menaced at the weakest point of her frontier. British trade in Persia—and practically the whole of the carrying trade is under the British flag—would suffer extinction, and the British line of sea communications and the future overland route would be threatened by the establishment of a Russian naval base, and the presence of the Russian ships in the Persian Gulf. It is indispensable that Britain should retain control of the Gulf.....The impossibility of England's opposing Russia in the North with any degree of success, and the supreme importance to England of the command of the Persian Gulf, are now acknowledged. The Persian Gulf is, and should remain a British lake." ⁷²

One authority, writing in this same year, preferred to regard the whole of Persia as the British sphere of influence. He points out that in actual fact the whole of Persia would be, commercially

⁷¹ *India Year Book* (1921).

⁷² COLQUHOUN, SIR ARCHIBALD; *Russia Against India* (1900), p. 180.

speaking, in the British net, as far as textile manufacturing was concerned, if a British railway were only pushed as far north as Hamadan and Teheran. "The whole aim and object of our policy in Persia first and last should be railways. Russia may have all the political prestige she wants as long as we control the railways from the Gulf to Teheran." ⁷³

In 1907, the Anglo-Russian treaty was made, which divided Persia into three zones, the North being apportioned to Russia, and the South to England, leaving Persia a strip of arid territory in the centre.

He further adds that, if necessary, Persia be partitioned :

"Whatever form the future railway system of Persia may take, it is almost a matter of course that the great plateau will be connected with the Gulf and the Indian Ocean by lines running at right angles to the coast.....All railways in Lower Persia must be controlled by Great Britain provided always that the Shah's Government is unable to cope with the task. If this means partition of Persia, then Persia must be divided, unless we are to allow Russia to dominate the whole of the kingdom." ⁷⁴

⁷³ WHIGHAM, J. H : *The Persian Problem*, p. 392.

⁷⁴ IBID., p. 68.

The Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 settled the disputes of these nations in Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet, the three shields of British India. Professor Seymour admirably sums up the causes which led up to this reversal of the century-old enmity between Russia and England into amity and co-operation. "The sudden and surprising reconciliation of Great Britain and Russia was chiefly facilitated by the attitude of each nation towards Germany. Great Britain was consumed with fear of the economic development of that nation and believed herself threatened directly by its world policy; the same factors that had led to her reconciliation with France made an understanding with Russia. Russia, on the other hand, after seeing her dream of Far Eastern domination shattered, was not grateful to Germany, who was largely responsible for the aggressive policy of Russia in China and Manchuria. Furthermore, the activity of Russia, checked in the Far East, must inevitably be turned towards the Balkans and Constantinople, and in this quarter Russian ambitions conflicted with Germany's purpose of controlling a sweep of territory extending from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf."

¹ 5 SEYMOUR, CHARLES: *The Diplomatic Background of the War, 1870-1914*, p. 160.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

Germany's growing strength as a maritime power had already caused apprehension in British minds. The words that Chatham applied to France, were remembered and applied to Germany. "Our first duty is to see that France does not become a naval, commercial and colonial power." With the development of Germany as a world power, menacing the maritime empire of Great Britain, the policy which had heretofore been directed towards France and Russia, was applied to Germany. Anglo-Russian and Anglo-French relations were adjusted, the latter by the Entente Cordiale of 1904, and the former through the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907, which in turn became the medium through which the Triple Entente was built up. Concurrently with this diplomatic revolution was carried out the policy of the encirclement of Germany, until in 1914 the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente faced the issue on the field of battle. Not least among the causes leading to this conflict was the question of the Bagdad Railway, or the land route to India.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS THE PERSIAN GULF AND THE BERLIN-BAGDAD RAILWAY

The significance of Anglo-German rivalry which culminated in the World War was foreseen as early as 1903 by that astute writer on Eastern affairs, Valentine Chirol. Under the general heading of "The Balance of Power," he refers to the effect on Britain's imperial interests of the advent of Germany in Asia. He called attention to the fact that it was not only British commercial supremacy that would be challenged if other nations once gained a foothold in the Persian Gulf. He said: "The whole balance of naval and military power in this part of Asia would inevitably be affected, and we should have no Japan upon whom we could call to redress it in our favour." This mention of Japan obviously refers to the Anglo-Japanese agreement of 1902. He continues: "To any one who is at all intimately acquainted with

international politics the idea that we could rely upon the appearance of Germany on the scene to act as a counterpoise to Russia must seem quite as futile as that Russia's policy of expansion in Asia can be arrested by graceful concessions. India would be for the first time upwards of a century, exposed to attack from a naval base within close proximity to her shores and that is a danger against which she could be protected so long as we preserve our command of the sea, it would mean an additional task for our navy and involve a substantial increase of the naval force permanently stationed in our Indian waters."⁷⁶

A land-route, a rail-road from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf under the British control would be a great asset to British imperial interests. This fact was not ignored by the British statesmen. In fact, the British Government was the first to consider the land route to Asia as the French Government was the first to encourage the Suez Canal project.

"Early in the seventies (1870) a select committee of the House of Commons already had occasion to examine an English project for the construction of a railroad to Asia Minor which was to run from Alexandretta via Aleppo to

⁷⁶ CHIBOL, p. 262.

Koweit; thus connecting the north-eastern corner of the Mediterranean with the Persian Gulf. Expert evidence taken at that time showed that this line would render enormous service to the British Empire as a second and more expeditious route to India and as opening access to the untold mineral and agricultural wealth." " "

It is interesting to note that Sir Valentine Chirol quotes the American naval authority, Admiral Mahan, with the greatest respect. Admiral Mahan had pointed out that Great Britain was more than intimately concerned in the fortunes of Turkey and Persia. He laid down three conditions of Britain's future in Asia, conditions "deep struck and closely intertwined in the soil of a past history." "First, her security in India, which would be materially affected by an adverse change in political control of the Gulf; secondly, the safety of the great sea-route, commercial and military, to India and the Farther East, on which British shipping is still actually the chief traveller, though with a notable diminution that demands national attention; and, thirdly, the economic and commercial welfare of India, which can act

77 MARTI, OSCAR A. : *Anglo-German Rivalry as a Cause of the Great War* p. 66.

politically only through the Empire, a dependence which greatly enhances obligation. The control of the Persian, Gulf by a foreign state of considerable naval potentiality, a fleet in being there based upon a strong military port, would reproduce the relations of Cadiz, Gibraltar, and Malta to the Mediterranean. It would flank all the routes to the Farther East, to India, and to Australia, the last two actually internal to the Empire regarded as a political system; and although at present Great Britain unquestionably would check such a fleet, so placed, by a division of her own, it might well require a detachment large enough to affect seriously the general strength of her naval position." ⁷ ⁸

The position of the British Government was clearly defined on May, 1903, when Lord Landsdowne declared that "we [*i. e.*, His Majesty's Government] should regard the establishment of a naval base or of a fortified port in the Persian Gulf by any other power as a very grave menace to British interests which we should certainly resist with all the means at our disposal."

In 1888 a railway concession in Asia minor had been granted to a group of Germans, backed by the Deutsche Bank. The first concession

⁷ ⁸ CHIROL, p. 264.

THE BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS THE PERSIAN

was followed by another which extended the railway to Konia. After the second visit of Kaiser Wilhelm II to Constantinople in 1898, another concession was granted in 1899 by the Ottoman Government which contemplated the extension of the railway from Konia to the Persian Gulf. The German financiers applied to the Turkish Government for a *firman*, which was granted in 1903, thus creating the Bagdad Railway Company. The only practical terminus was at Koweit, on the Persian Gulf. In 1899 Colonel Meade, the British resident of the Persian Gulf, signed with the Sheik of Koweit a secret convention which assured to him "special protection" if he would make no concession of territory without the knowledge and consent of the British Government. When a German mission appeared at Koweit in 1900, to arrange the concession for the terminus they were refused. In 1901, a Turkish vessel was sent to Koweit to enforce the authority of the Sublime Porte, but British warship and British blue-jackets upheld the independence of Koweit."

Failing in obtaining the Persian Gulf terminus, Germany finally secured concessions for

THE BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS PERSIAN GULF

"We have always demanded the control and construction of the line south of Bagdad and cannot content ourselves with less. No doubt can exist that the railway will be built eventually, whether England and Russia take a part or not ; and from this point of view England must give serious consideration to the present situation and the Gwinner proposals. But before anything further can be done in the matter Grey would like to have Russia's opinion. There is one reason which makes the question of the southern sector of the railway a most urgent one ; the Turkish Government is starting irrigation work south of Bagdad, and it is probable that the rivers will cease to be navigable owing to lack of water. The river-transport of Anglo-Indian commerce which has been in British hands for more than fifty years, would thus be utterly lost, without any possibility of substitute until the railway is built." ^{s 2}

That the projected railway and the possibility of an Anglo-German agreement was viewed with some apprehension by France is evidenced by the following letter from the Russian ambassador at Constantinople to Iswolsky dated December 8, 1909 : "The English communications have made

^{s 2} DE SIEBERT AND SCHREINER : *Entente Diplomacy and the World*, p. 508.

a painful impression on the Paris Cabinet. One naturally concedes England's fair behaviour in this matter and that she has kept her promise to consider, together with France and Russia, a possible understanding with Germany concerning the Bagdad Railway. But one can read between the lines of the English communication that England is very desirous of accepting the German proposals, although the latter are not at all in keeping with French interests and hardly do justice to ours.

"According to the contents, the projected treaty is of the greatest importance; it is equivalent to the partition of Turkey into a British and a German sphere of interest; England granting Germany freedom of action in Turkey, in Europe and in Asia Minor, and claiming such for herself only in the Turkish territories in the vicinity of the Persian Gulf.

"The French Ambassador is of the opinion that England is more and more concentrating all her energies on the domination of the roads leading to India—the Persian Gulf and the Indian Plains—and England appears to be less and less interested in Constantinople and the Turkish problems proper. The London Cabinet has safeguarded itself by its conventions with Russia against an extension of Russian in-

THE BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS PERSIAN GULF

fluence in the Persian Gulf. The projected treaty with Germany completes England's sovereignty in the Persian Gulf. England will then attempt to free herself in Egypt from the obligations to obtain Turkey's sanction in certain political and financial matters, and once this end is attained, England will no longer take an active part in the other questions...." ³³

In 1910 discussion of the Bagdad Railway between Britain and Russia centred around the possibility of linking up the Russian and Indian railways in Persia. The Russian ambassador at London reported to Sazonoff, on December 15, 1910, as follows: "Even if the fear of an invasion of India by Russia has now vanished, yet too close a connection of the Bagdad Railway with the Indian railways through Persia creates no inconsiderable difficulties. A strategic main line, beginning in Turkey, would thus exist: this circumstance must be taken into serious consideration nowadays when Islam appears to be awakening everywhere." ³⁴

Apparently in 1914 Britain was still suspicious of Russia's position in Persia. Sazonoff wrote to the Russian ambassador at London

³³ DE SIEBERT AND SCHREINER, *Ibid.*, p. 511

³⁴ DE SIEBERT AND SCHREINER, *Ibid.*, p. 525.

Russia. But in the east and south of Persia there are regions in which the presence of Russia, or, for the matter of that, if it were conceivable the presence of any other foreign military power would inevitably constitute a grave potential menace to the peace and security of India..... If Russia proved as reasonable as her champions anticipate, a big step would have been taken towards removing the atmosphere of suspicion which, on both sides, at present vitiates our relations with her..... The worst of all policies is the policy of drift, for those who take refuge in it invariably end by being its dupes. In China it led us into a mass of embarrassments from which we have not yet extricated ourselves, even with the help of the Japanese alliance. Where, as in Southern and Eastern Persia, the security of India is concerned it might well land us in a national catastrophe." 70

On May 5, 1903, Lord Lansdowne made the following declaration: "We, His Majesty's Government should regard the establishment of a naval base or of a fortified port in the Persian Gulf by another Power as a very grave menace to British interests, which we should certainly resist with all the means at our disposal." This

70 CHIROL, *Ibid.*, p. 308.

policy has been confirmed by Sir Edward Grey and later British Foreign Ministers.”⁷¹

The British policy towards the Persian Gulf has been to make it a British lake :

“The disadvantages to Britain in allowing a Russian absorption of Persia are obvious. India would be menaced at the weakest point of her frontier. British trade in Persia—and practically the whole of the carrying trade is under the British flag—would suffer extinction, and the British line of sea communications and the future overland route would be threatened by the establishment of a Russian naval base, and the presence of the Russian ships in the Persian Gulf. It is indispensable that Britain should retain control of the Gulf.....The impossibility of England’s opposing Russia in the North with any degree of success, and the supreme importance to England of the command of the Persian Gulf, are now acknowledged. The Persian Gulf is, and should remain a British lake.”⁷²

One authority, writing in this same year, preferred to regard the whole of Persia as the British sphere of influence. He points out that in actual fact the whole of Persia would be, commercially

⁷¹ *India Year Book* (1921).

⁷² COLQUHOUN, SIR ARCHIBALD; *Russia Against India* (1900), p. 180.

speaking, in the British net, as far as textile manufacturing was concerned, if a British railway were only pushed as far north as Hamadan and Teheran. "The whole aim and object of our policy in Persia first and last should be railways. Russia may have all the political prestige she wants as long as we control the railways from the Gulf to Teheran." ⁷³

In 1907, the Anglo-Russian treaty was made, which divided Persia into three zones, the North being apportioned to Russia, and the South to England, leaving Persia a strip of arid territory in the centre.

He further adds that, if necessary, Persia be partitioned :

"Whatever form the future railway system of Persia may take, it is almost a matter of course that the great plateau will be connected with the Gulf and the Indian Ocean by lines running at right angles to the coast.....All railways in Lower Persia must be controlled by Great Britain provided always that the Shah's Government is unable to cope with the task. If this means partition of Persia, then Persia must be divided, unless we are to allow Russia to dominate the whole of the kingdom." ⁷⁴

⁷³ WHIGHAM, J. H : *The Persian Problem*, p. 392.

⁷⁴ IBID., p. 68.

The Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 settled the disputes of these nations in Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet, the three shields of British India. Professor Seymour admirably sums up the causes which led up to this reversal of the century-old enmity between Russia and England into amity and co-operation. "The sudden and surprising reconciliation of Great Britain and Russia was chiefly facilitated by the attitude of each nation towards Germany. Great Britain was consumed with fear of the economic development of that nation and believed herself threatened directly by its world policy; the same factors that had led to her reconciliation with France made an understanding with Russia. Russia, on the other hand, after seeing her dream of Far Eastern domination shattered, was not grateful to Germany, who was largely responsible for the aggressive policy of Russia in China and Manchuria. Furthermore, the activity of Russia, checked in the Far East, must inevitably be turned towards the Balkans and Constantinople, and in this quarter Russian ambitions conflicted with Germany's purpose of controlling a sweep of territory extending from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf." '5

'5 SEYMOUR, CHARLES: *The Diplomatic Background of the War, 1870-1914*, p. 160.

Germany's growing strength as a maritime power had already caused apprehension in British minds. The words that Chatham applied to France, were remembered and applied to Germany. "Our first duty is to see that France does not become a naval, commercial and colonial power." With the development of Germany as a world power, menacing the maritime empire of Great Britain, the policy which had heretofore been directed towards France and Russia, was applied to Germany. Anglo-Russian and Anglo-French relations were adjusted, the latter by the Entente Cordiale of 1904, and the former through the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907, which in turn became the medium through which the Triple Entente was built up. Concurrently with this diplomatic revolution was carried out the policy of the encirclement of Germany, until in 1914 the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente faced the issue on the field of battle. Not least among the causes leading to this conflict was the question of the Bagdad Railway, or the land route to India.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS THE PERSIAN GULF AND THE BERLIN-BAGDAD RAILWAY

The significance of Anglo-German rivalry which culminated in the World War was foreseen as early as 1903 by that astute writer on Eastern affairs, Valentine Chirol. Under the general heading of "The Balance of Power," he refers to the effect on Britain's imperial interests of the advent of Germany in Asia. He called attention to the fact that it was not only British commercial supremacy that would be challenged if other nations once gained a foothold in the Persian Gulf. He said: "The whole balance of naval and military power in this part of Asia would inevitably be affected, and we should have no Japan upon whom we could call to redress it in our favour." This mention of Japan obviously refers to the Anglo-Japanese agreement of 1902. He continues: "To any one who is at all intimately acquainted with

international politics the idea that we could rely upon the appearance of Germany on the scene to act as a counterpoise to Russia must seem quite as futile as that Russia's policy of expansion in Asia can be arrested by graceful concessions. India would be for the first time upwards of a century, exposed to attack from a naval base within close proximity to her shores and that is a danger against which she could be protected so long as we preserve our command of the sea, it would mean an additional task for our navy and involve a substantial increase of the naval force permanently stationed in our Indian waters."^{7 6}

A land-route, a rail-road from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf under the British control would be a great asset to British imperial interests. This fact was not ignored by the British statesmen. In fact, the British Government was the first to consider the land route to Asia as the French Government was the first to encourage the Suez Canal project.

"Early in the seventies (1870) a select committee of the House of Commons already had occasion to examine an English project for the construction of a railroad to Asia Minor which was to run from Alexandretta via Aleppo to

^{7 6} CHIBOL, p. 262.

Koweit; thus connecting the north-eastern corner of the Mediterranean with the Persian Gulf. Expert evidence taken at that time showed that this line would render enormous service to the British Empire as a second and more expeditious route to India and as opening access to the untold mineral and agricultural wealth." "

It is interesting to note that Sir Valentine Chirol quotes the American naval authority, Admiral Mahan, with the greatest respect. Admiral Mahan had pointed out that Great Britain was more than intimately concerned in the fortunes of Turkey and Persia. He laid down three conditions of Britain's future in Asia, conditions "deep struck and closely intertwined in the soil of a past history." "First, her security in India, which would be materially affected by an adverse change in political control of the Gulf; secondly, the safety of the great sea-route, commercial and military, to India and the Farther East, on which British shipping is still actually the chief traveller, though with a notable diminution that demands national attention; and, thirdly, the economic and commercial welfare of India, which can act

" MARTI, OSCAR A. : *Anglo-German Rivalry as a Cause of the Great War* p. 66.

politically only through the Empire, a dependence which greatly enhances obligation. The control of the Persian, Gulf by a foreign state of considerable naval potentiality, a fleet in being there based upon a strong military port, would reproduce the relations of Cadiz, Gibraltar, and Malta to the Mediterranean. It would flank all the routes to the Farther East, to India, and to Australia, the last two actually internal to the Empire regarded as a political system; and although at present Great Britain unquestionably would check such a fleet, so placed, by a division of her own, it might well require a detachment large enough to affect seriously the general strength of her naval position.”⁷⁸

The position of the British Government was clearly defined on May, 1903, when Lord Landsdowne declared that “we [*i. e.*, His Majesty’s Government] should regard the establishment of a naval base or of a fortified port in the Persian Gulf by any other power as a very grave menace to British interests which we should certainly resist with all the means at our disposal.”

In 1888 a railway concession in Asia minor had been granted to a group of Germans, backed by the Deutsche Bank. The first concession

⁷⁸ CHIBOL, p. 264.

was followed by another which extended the railway to Konia. After the second visit of Kaiser Wilhelm II to Constantinople in 1898, another concession was granted in 1899 by the Ottoman Government which contemplated the extension of the railway from Konia to the Persian Gulf. The German financiers applied to the Turkish Government for a *firman*, which was granted in 1903, thus creating the Bagdad Railway Company. The only practical terminus was at Koweit, on the Persian Gulf. In 1899 Colonel Meade, the British resident of the Persian Gulf, signed with the Sheik of Koweit a secret convention which assured to him "special protection" if he would make no concession of territory without the knowledge and consent of the British Government. When a German mission appeared at Koweit in 1900, to arrange the concession for the terminus they were refused. In 1901, a Turkish vessel was sent to Koweit to enforce the authority of the Sublime Porte, but British warship and British blue-jackets upheld the independence of Koweit."

Failing in obtaining the Persian Gulf terminus, Germany finally secured concessions for

79 GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS: *The New Map of Europe*, pp. 56-66.

a branch line from Aleppo to the Mediterranean terminating at Alexandretta, and another concession for the construction of a fortified port at Alexandretta. This would give Germany a naval base eight hours from Cyprus and thirty-six hours from the Suez Canal. ⁸⁰

In the opinion of Professor Morris Jastrow, "The Bagdad Railway was the largest single contributing factor to the World War." ⁸¹

The following quotations are taken from that unique volume, "Entente Diplomacy and the World," by De Siebert and Schreiner. It is composed of the diplomatic documents and correspondence of the Imperial Russian Government, which the writers believed would repose forever in the secret archives of the Governments concerned. Beyond all doubt they reveal the attitudes of the Imperial Russian and British Governments towards the German project of the Bagdad Railway. This particular interchange of correspondence took place in 1909. The British ambassador at St. Petersburg said to Iswolsky (Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs): "My Government is most desirous of learning the conditions under which the Russian Government would take part in the railway north of Bagdad.

⁸⁰ GIBBONS, *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁸¹ JASTROW, MORRIS: *The Berlin-Bagdad Railway*. p. 194

"We have always demanded the control and construction of the line south of Bagdad and cannot content ourselves with less. No doubt can exist that the railway will be built eventually, whether England and Russia take a part or not ; and from this point of view England must give serious consideration to the present situation and the Gwinner proposals. But before anything further can be done in the matter Grey would like to have Russia's opinion. There is one reason which makes the question of the southern sector of the railway a most urgent one ; the Turkish Government is starting irrigation work south of Bagdad, and it is probable that the rivers will cease to be navigable owing to lack of water. The river-transport of Anglo-Indian commerce which has been in British hands for more than fifty years, would thus be utterly lost, without any possibility of substitute until the railway is built." ^{s 2}

That the projected railway and the possibility of an Anglo-German agreement was viewed with some apprehension by France is evidenced by the following letter from the Russian ambassador at Constantinople to Iswolsky dated December 8, 1909 : "The English communications have made

^{s 2} DE SIEBERT AND SCHREINER: *Entente Diplomacy and the World*, p. 508.

a painful impression on the Paris Cabinet. One naturally concedes England's fair behaviour in this matter and that she has kept her promise to consider, together with France and Russia, a possible understanding with Germany concerning the Bagdad Railway. But one can read between the lines of the English communication that England is very desirous of accepting the German proposals, although the latter are not at all in keeping with French interests and hardly do justice to ours.

"According to the contents, the projected treaty is of the greatest importance; it is equivalent to the partition of Turkey into a British and a German sphere of interest; England granting Germany freedom of action in Turkey in Europe and in Asia Minor, and claiming such for herself only in the Turkish territories in the vicinity of the Persian Gulf.

"The French Ambassador is of the opinion that England is more and more concentrating all her energies on the domination of the roads leading to India—the Persian Gulf and the Indian Plains—and England appears to be less and less interested in Constantinople and the Turkish problems proper. The London Cabinet has safeguarded itself by its conventions with Russia against an extension of Russian in-

fluence in the Persian Gulf. The projected treaty with Germany completes England's sovereignty in the Persian Gulf. England will then attempt to free herself in Egypt from the obligations to obtain Turkey's sanction in certain political and financial matters, and once this end is attained, England will no longer take an active part in the other questions...." ⁸³

In 1910 discussion of the Bagdad Railway between Britain and Russia centred around the possibility of linking up the Russian and Indian railways in Persia. The Russian ambassador at London reported to Sazonoff, on December 15, 1910, as follows: "Even if the fear of an invasion of India by Russia has now vanished, yet too close a connection of the Bagdad Railway with the Indian railways through Persia creates no inconsiderable difficulties. A strategical main line, beginning in Turkey, would thus exist: this circumstance must be taken into serious consideration nowadays when Islam appears to be awakening everywhere." ⁸⁴

Apparently in 1914 Britain was still suspicious of Russia's position in Persia. Sazonoff wrote to the Russian ambassador at London

⁸³ DE SIEBERT AND SCHREINER, *Ibid.*, p. 511

⁸⁴ DE SIEBERT AND SCHREINER, *Ibid.*, p. 525.

on June 25, 1914, as follows : ".....I had another long conversation, yesterday, with the British ambassador, whose attention I called to the serious danger of a cooling of our relations to England on account of the Persian Question. I assured that the perturbation and excitement, which had been noticeable of late in England, were most likely to be traced back to the fact that fears as to the position of England in India were once more becoming manifest. Sir George Buchanan conceded that my assumption was for the greater part correct. In consequence, I once more repeated to him all the arguments which prove how unfounded all such fears are, and I even hinted that, should it be desired, we could give to the British Government, and to public opinion there, reassuring declarations in regard to this in the most decisive form:

"I have for the present contented myself with these hints ; yet it seems to me quite possible that, latter on, in connection with our further negotiations, we might propose to England to give her a guarantee of her Indian possessions as effective as that given her by Japan in 1902." ^{s 5}

On July 2, 1914, one month before the outbreak

^{s 5} DE SIEBERT AND SCHREINER, *Ibid.*, p. 732.

f the World War, the Russian ambassador at London replied to the above communication in the following words: "In as much as the security of India is a consequence of the political entente between Russia and England, it follows that public opinion in England, as well as the British Government, in full confidence as to our intentions, have no fears, so long as this entente exists. Should this entente come to an end, there would be a revival of the fear in question.....

"This does not, however, preclude the possibility of finding, in connection with certain modifications of our present agreements, a formula which would give expression to the security of India in a still more direct manner: this would merely make our entente still closer."

It is to be inferred from the general tenor of this correspondence that the "formula" to be sought was a naval convention between Britain and Russia, similar to, and concurrent with, that entered into between Britain and France, the existence of which is admitted in the last letter quoted above, although Sir Edward Grey had denied the existence of such a convention.

It is evident that Russia and Britain before the World War made agreements against the interests of Persia and India. Today Persia is

free from Russian control, and Russia is against British imperialism. Persian people should realize that their safety is bound to be menaced, as long as India remains under foreign domination. It is not wise either for Persia or India to be less alert regarding their national security, depending upon the altruism of Soviet Russia; because there can never be a permanent guarantee that there will not occur a rapprochement between Britain and Russia protecting their mutual interests in Asia and Europe. Indo-Persian agreement for defensive purposes is the natural thing for the security of these two nations; and this can only be brought about when India and Persia will enjoy full control over their destinies as independent nations.

CHAPTER NINE

ANGLO-AFGHAN RELATIONS AND INDIA

AFGHANISTAN was once an integral part of the ancient Hindu Empires and was then known as the Province of Gandhara. The significance of Afghanistan in British World Politics lies in the fact that it is the only important land approach to India. It was through Afghanistan that India was invaded time and again by various nations. The Persians under the leadership of Darius entered India through Afghanistan and established a satrapy in the Punjab. At the time of Alexander the Great, the Greeks started to conquer India, marching through Afghanistan, and entered the Punjab where they were ultimately defeated by Chandra Gupta, grandfather of Asoka the Great. The history of Pathan and Mogul invasions and the plundering enterprises of Nadir Shah in India have intimate relations with Afghanistan. On the other hand Akbar the Great, the Mogul Emperor of India,

realizing the strategic position of Afghanistan, sent his Hindu general, Man Singh, to conquer and control it as an integral part of India.

During the nineteenth century Russian expansion in Central Asia threatening British control of India created apprehensions among the British authorities ; and Afghanistan formed the seat of Russian and British intrigues, each of these powers anxious to secure Afghan support against the other. Lord Roberts in his "Forty-One Years in India" points out that at times British statesmen, Lord Dalhousie and others, thought it wise to remain friendly with Afghanistan and to use her against Russia. As the situation developed unfavourably for Britain, conquest of Afghanistan became the British policy. The first Afghan War of 1838 was undertaken by the British Government to depose Dost Mohammad Khan, the Amir of Afghanistan who had thrown heart and soul into the Russo-Persian Alliance inimical to British interests. Again in 1878, Amir Sher Ali Khan being suspected of intriguing with Russia, British forces attacked Afghanistan and marched to Kabul. On the whole, however, the British policy was to preserve Afghanistan as a buffer state between India and Russia.

Since then British efforts have been directed

making the Amir of Afghanistan subsidiary to Britain with a semblance of independence (something like the Nizam of Hyderabad or at the most, like the King of Nepal) by giving financial aid and exercising diplomatic control. After the British conquest of Baluchistan, the shutting off of Afghanistan from any sea communication, and Britain's friendly relations with Persia and the Russian advance to Central Asia forced Afghanistan, as a matter of self-interest, to be non-committal and apparently friendly to Britain.

The Anglo-Russian Entente (1907) which was so necessary to the policy of encirclement of Germany led to the understanding that Afghanistan and Tibet and Southern Persia would be within the British sphere of influence, whereas Mongolia and Manchuria and Northern Persia would go to Russia. Article I of the conventions regarding Afghanistan reads as follows :

"Great Britain disclaims any intention of changing the political position of Afghanistan nor to encourage Afghanistan to threaten Russia. Russia recognizes Afghanistan as outside her sphere of influence, and agrees to act in political relations with Afghanistan through Great Britain and to send no agents to Afghanistan."

This Anglo-Russian understanding against Afghan independence was never acknowledged.

as binding by the the Amir of Afghanistan, and it made the Afghans feel that they must protect their national independence through close co-operation with other nations. So during the World War Afghan sympathies were with Turkey and the Central Powers and Turko-German military and diplomatic missions were received by the Afghan Government. But the Amir Habibulla Khan judiciously and persistently refused to attack India at the suggestion of Germany and Turkey because Turkey and Germany were in no position to aid Afghanistan with military force or arms or ammunitions. It was evident that Afghanistan would not have been able to hold her own against British forces from India and Baluchistan and the Russian forces from Turkestan and Persia.

Since the conclusion of the World War and the fall of Imperial Russia, Afghanistan's military and diplomatic position has been considerably strengthened. Soviet Russia's repudiation of the Anglo-Russian Entente, conclusion of Afghan-Russian pact, and Anglo-Persian misunderstanding made it possible for Afghanistan to take a decided stand against Britain, and favour Turkey in her struggle against Greece. She also expressed in various ways good-will to the people of India in their struggle for independence.

In 1919, alarmed by the Afghan-Russian pact Britain, in violation of the then existing treaty between Afghanistan and herself, attacked Afghanistan. The adventure was both costly and sanguinary because of the bravery of the Afghans. Britain did not hesitate to adopt the policy of frightfulness and used bombs from aeroplanes on unfortified cities and villages to create panic among the Afghan people. Indian national sympathy was overwhelmingly in favour of Afghanistan and fearing serious revolutionary trouble in India, Britain did not march to Kabul but made an agreement with Afghanistan.

The success of Afghanistan in securing alliances and close friendly understandings with Soviet Russia, Persia and Turkey, and the recognition accorded to Afghanistan, as an independent power by Germany, Poland, France and other European states have forced Britain to give up the theory of making Afghanistan a dependency. Britain therefore had to recognize Afghanistan as an independent nation, and signed a treaty on November 22, 1921, to that effect. Mr. Hirtzell, Deputy Under-Secretary of State for India has summarized it as follows :

“Satisfactory written assurances having been given by Afghanistan that Russian Consulates—

that is, of course propaganda bases—should be excluded from the Indo-Afghan frontier, the way seemed open to fruitful negotiations... The two governments agreed to respect one another's international and external independence; to recognize boundaries then existent, subject to slight readjustment near the Khyber; to receive legations at London and Kabul and consular officers at Delhi, Calcutta, Karachi, Bombay, Kandhar and Jalalabad respectively. The Afghan Government is allowed to import free of custom duty such material as is required for the strengthening of their country. So long as the British are assured that the intentions of the Afghans are friendly, this proviso applies to arms and ammunition also. The export of goods to British territory from Afghanistan is permitted while separate postal and trade conventions are to be concluded in future. Further, each party undertakes to inform the other of major military operations in the vicinity of the border line.”^{86a}

If Afghanistan actively allies herself with “external forces” opposed to Britain and aids them in a campaign of invasion of India, Britain

^{86a} The complete text of the treaty with two “schedules” are to be found as Appendix VII of the *British Blue Book: Statement exhibiting moral and material progress and condition of India during the year 1921*.

must fight Afghanistan. The possible combination of France, Russia, Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan and other powers marching towards India is haunting British statesmen. The argument often heard against the independence of India is this. She would not be able to defend herself against any such combination mentioned above if her people are properly armed and trained for national defence. Britain wishes to keep India in subjection at any cost and thus she refuses the Indian people the responsibility of national defence, even refuses the equal opportunity for military training as soldiers and officers. This British policy is responsible for the creation of a school of Indian nationalists who would be willing to combine with external forces to aid them in invading India. They advocate this policy to drive the British quickly out of India. Some of them have made extravagant statements to the effect that the Indian people would be glad to have the Amir of Afghanistan as ruler of India in place of British rule in India, but the real fact is that responsible Indian nationalists are working for a Federated Republic of the United States of India and they have no use for any proposition which would lead to even a shadow of any foreign control of India.

Another school of Indian revolutionists look

upon Afghanistan as a strong friendly neighbouring power to act as a savior of India. Indo-Afghan co-operation will aid in freeing India. Free India will not have to seek any military aid from any quarter, but many other states will have to court India's friendship. In fact, Afghanistan will have to depend upon Indian co-operation and friendship when India becomes free.

There are others in India who like Hon. Aga Khan, advocate the idea of a federation of South Asian States from Burma to Suez in close co-operation with the British Empire. In this plan India will form the centre of the federation with Afghanistan as an integral part. But these are views of a few. Any attempt to develop such a programme may support the false impression spread by such men as Sir Philip Gibbs, that India is trying to co-operate with all the Mohammedan countries of the world against Christian Europe. India is not sympathetic to any such scheme.

An offensive and defensive alliance between the free Federated Republic of the United States of India and the Kingdom of Afghanistan will be of great value to both the countries; but any program even remotely suggestive of Indian imperialism towards Afghanistan or Afghan dictation to India would hurt the vital interests

ANGLO-AFGHAN RELATIONS AND INDIA

of both nations. At the present juncture the policy of the present Amir, to aid in Hindu-Muslim unity in India and to cement friendly relations between the people of Afghanistan and India should be so fostered that it may lead to closer political understanding protecting the mutual interests of two absolutely independent nations. Afghanistan will then hold in Asia the enviable position of Switzerland, enjoying peace and freedom.

CHAPTER TEN

ANGLO-JAPANESE RELATIONS AS INFLUENCED BY INDIA.

The first agreement, concluded in 1902 between Great Britain and Japan purported to be concerned only with English interests in China and Japanese interests in China and Korea. It was a matter of common knowledge that the impelling motive was fear of Russian expansion in Central Asia which had advanced step by step until it threatened Anglo-Japanese interests in Far East. It has not been so generally known that, as stated in the correspondence discovered in the secret archives of Russia, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance likewise offered security guarantees for the protection of India from Russian attack.

There was some understanding between Japan and Britain regarding Japan extending military aid to Britain in India against Russian invasion.

"It is fact which is but little known, but which throw a lurid light on the whole future

England in Asia, that during the Russo-Japanese War, the Japanese military officer attached to the Commander-in-chief of India, offered formally, but confidentially, to Lord Kitchener one Japanese division of reserve troops for service in India should Russia show any activity on the north-western frontier." ^{s 7}

In the Anglo-Japanese Alliances signed at London in 1905 and 1911, India is specifically referred to. Two of the three clauses which constitute the preamble to this important treaty deal with India.

Article A.—The consolidation and maintenance of the general peace in the regions of Eastern Asia and India.

Article C.—The maintenance of the territorial rights of the High Contracting Parties in the regions of Eastern Asia and of India and the defence of their special interests in those regions.

Most of the Japanese scholars and statesmen hold that Japan entered the Russo-Japanese War as a matter of life and death for her. Britain did not risk anything by promising

^{s 7} (A quotation from a Staff Officer's Scrap Book by General Sir Ian Hamilton to be found at the foot-note of the page 210 of *Japan's Foreign Policy*, by A. M. POOLEY)

support to Japan though she had everything to gain. This view is supported by Mr. Pooley :

"If Japan won, Russia would no longer be dangerous on the Indian frontier, whilst France having put all her funds in Russia, would have to curtail her colonial aspirations. . . . The reward Japan was to reap for success was Korea and whatever she could screw out of Russia and China in Manchuria." ^{s s}

To-day Anglo-Japanese rivalry is very deep; whenever a responsible Japanese merchant or traveller or educator or journalist goes to India he is followed by British spies.

"The growing friendship between the natives of India and the Japanese has furnished another cause of suspicion, not to say irritation on the part of England. It is nothing new that even bonafide Japanese travellers and merchants in India are subjected to espionage by British officials. Not only the Englishmen in India have suspicions of those Japanese likely to come in contact with the radical elements of the Hindu population, but they have shown disposition to exclude Japanese enterprise from the country. . . . When in the summer of 1906, S. Rabindranath Tagore, India's foremost poet and savant, visited Japan, the Japanese Government

^{s s} POOLEY, A. M.: *Japan's Foreign Policies*, p. 13.

again at England's request, watched him so closely that the distinguished guest made no effort to conceal his disgust." *⁹

Anglo-Japanese relations are not so cordial and the responsible Japanese have reasons to believe that Britain carries on anti-Japanese propaganda secretly and that is not conducive to the existing political understanding between these two powers. Dr. Miyake Setsurei, one of Japan's foremost journalists and sociologists, writing (1916) in the *Nippon-Oyobi-Nipponjin* (Japan and the Japanese) says :

"Japan is desirous of extending her influence in East Asia as much as Great Britain is jealous of maintaining her ground. Impartially speaking, however, it may be considered that the British attitude towards Japan is too nervous and stringent. That Great Britain should strive for maintenance of her interest in the Yangtze valley is not surprising, but it is inexplicable that the British should try to build a parallel line to a proposed Japanese line in China and to induce the Chinese to publish articles that will inflame anti-Japanese feeling among them. ... Financially speaking, Japan is an insignificant country, in comparison with Great Britain, but in the East she is stronger than any of the European powers

*⁹ KAWAKAMI, K. K. : *Japan in World Politics*, pp. 262-263.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

.. For this reason it will not be advantageous for a country already allied to Japan to sever the bond at the present moment.”⁹⁰

This rivalry has economic and political backgrounds, as it was in the case of Anglo-German rivalry. Japan is challenging British commercial and political supremacy in the Far East. This challenge is resented by the British, and they will retaliate at an opportune moment. The sooner Japan and the Japanese people realize it the better it will be for their national safety and for the cause of world peace.

Mr. Pooley voices the sentiment that the British merchants should do their best to preserve their own from the increasing Japanese competition in India and other countries :

“The point which British manufacturers have to consider is to what extent Japan is destined to become a formidable rival of her own in, principally cotton goods, iron and steel products and in shipping. ...In particular, for political as well as economic reasons we ought to make every effort to restore our position in India, in the Straits and in Australia.”⁹¹

Mr. Ellis Barker sees that the root of Anglo-Japanese rivalry lies in the struggle for the

⁹⁰ POOLEY, A. M. : *Japan's Foreign Policy* (1920), pp, 28-29.

⁹¹ POOLEY, A. M. : *Foreign Policy of Japan*, p. 195.

Yell. & Se. The trade of Asia, and particularly, the
 a. He presents the following facts.
 Comment of Japan's export trade in the
~~has~~ been amazing. During the decade
 her exports to China have trebled,
~~exports~~ exports to British India. Between
 Japan's exports to China have
 and those to India tenfold...The
 development which the Japanese industries
 have secured during the struggle [the World
 War] will before long, no doubt, affect the com-
 mercial position in the Far East, for Japan may
 be expected to concentrate her energies once
 more upon the gigantic markets of Asia. ...Great
 Britain is strongly, one might say vitally, interest-
 ed in the Asiatic markets, and especially in the
 Indian market, which is by far the most impor-
 tant market of Lancashire. India takes the bulk
 of British cottons. Now it must be remembered
 that the cotton industry has become the most
 important industry of Japan. ...Japan after having
 completed the economic conquest of China, may
 begin and complete the economic conquest of
 India. That would be Lancaster's ruin, for the
 bulk of Lancaster's manufactures are sold in that
 country. It is only reasonable that Japan strives
 to dominate with her manufactures the Chinese
 market, but it is equally reasonable that the

Indian market should be reserved to "stageous for
tants of the Empire." ^{9 2} sever the

In spite of the profession of friend
British officials, British people are political back-
to Japan and that is quite clear Anglo-German
have visited the Far East where commercial
political and economic influence Far East. This
that of Britain. Typical expression and they will
attitude towards Japan is clear in the following
passage written by an eminent British publicist
as late as 1919 :

"This [Japanese] challenge to the world's
decency however can no longer be disregarded;
it must be taken up, since imperialist Germany
cannot be considered properly crushed until her
copied methods have been eradicated from the
Far East. ...For it is force that is behind the
Japanese program—not equity or justice, but force
mixed with corruption. This force is today semi-
antiquated; for the Japanese armaments are
much where they were after the Russo-Japanese
War, are totally unequal to the challenge offered
to first-class maritime Powers with great interests
to protect in the Far East. ...Grey battle-ships on
the horizon line would bring home to Japanese
leaders what all the butchery of the war has
failed to teach; too long have the waters of the

^{9 2} BARKER ELLIS : *Economic Statesmanship*, pp. 434-442.

... been without adequate protection. ...
 justice enough left over after Europe
 her own troubles, Eastern Asia is
~~the~~ first claimant. Unless that precious
 is ~~not~~ sed in abundance, the day is not far
~~when~~ the crash will come and men
 again." ⁹³

The Japanese publicists and statesmen think
 that the Japanese people will not be disposed to
 aid Britain in putting down Indian aspirations
 for national independence. Kawakami states,
 "The provision of the existing treaty of alliance
 as to Japan's duty with regard to India is not
 clear. Suppose India rose in rebellion while
 England's hands were full in Europe: would
 Japan be required to quell the insurrection in
 virtue of the alliance? Japan would undoubt-
 edly prefer British rule for India to German or
 Russian domination, if the country had to be
 dominated by some European power; but the
 point is that she would be reluctant to take part
 in crushing the just aspiration of the Hindus
 for independence and freedom." ⁹⁴

Although the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1911
 was automatically continued in 1921 after careful

⁹³ WEALE, B. L. PUTNAM: *Truth About China and Japan*,
 pp. 151-154.

⁹⁴ KAWAKAMI, K. K. : *Japan in World Politics*, p. 264.

consideration by the British Government. The real reason was not any special consideration for Japan, but fear that Japan's policy was antagonistic to British occupation in political and economic spheres. An Oriental student of Eastern foreign relations confirms the theory that should Britain break the alliance (which is now superseded by the Four Power Pact), she would be confronted by Japanese resentment, and this resentment "would surely manifest itself in hostile fomentation of rebellions in India and Egypt and other territories, if not in entering into alliance with the enemies of Great Britain."^{9 5}

It is only a question of time when Japanese statesmen will recognize that a free India will be of greater benefit to Japanese interests and may serve as a source of strength and security to Japan, creating a new balance of power in Asia and world politics in general.

^{9 5} BAU, M. J. : *The Foreign Relations of China*, p. 146.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

ANGLO-CHINESE RELATIONS AS INFLUENCED BY INDIA

ANGLO-CHINESE relations have been intimately connected with the history of British India. In 1792 a special embassy was sent to Peking on behalf of the East India Company, under the leadership of Earl Macartney. The specific object of this mission was to open up Chinese ports to British trade, but no success was achieved at this time.

An early precedent for the invasion of the territorial integrity of China occurred in 1802, and it is significant that this was done by order of Lord Wellesley, Governor-General of India. Macao was occupied for the purpose of protecting that port, on behalf of Portugal, against a possible French attack.

Chong Su See, in his work "Foreign Trade of China," relates: "The Chinese rightly

remonstrated against this forcible possession of their territory, and demanded that the troops depart promptly, at the same time making it absolutely clear that Macao was an integral part of the Celestial Empire, and that Portuguese were allowed to remain in the place merely as tenants at will, paying an annual rental to the Chinese Government. Happily, news of the Peace of Amiens soon reached China, and the troops withdrew." ⁹⁶

Six years later, by order of another Governor-General of India, Lord Minto, another invasion of China took place, when a detachment of soldiers was sent to Macao. It is further related by Dr. Chong Su See that the court of Directors of the East India Company maintained that no apprehension need be entertained of embarrassment from the Chinese Government, if permission were obtained from the Portuguese for that purpose. The Chinese remonstrance was unheeded, and when they suspended trade and denied provisions to the British ships the British admiral, Drury, refused to re-embark his men and informed the Chinese officials that his instructions had not forbidden him to declare war against the Chinese nation, if necessary.

⁹⁶ CHONG SU SEE : *The Foreign Trade of China*, p. 74.

When he attempted to force his way to Canton, he was met with armed resistance, and desisted from the attempt.

Another expedition which set out from England in 1816 likewise was unsuccessful, for the Chinese were alarmed by the British expansion in India, where the British had subdued Nepal, a feudatory of China.

The Opium War of 1840, and the so-called Opium War of 1856, were waged against China by Great Britain for the purpose not only of securing territorial and port concession but of maintaining the opium trade because of its profit to the British East India Company.

Discussing Anglo-Chinese relations, Dr. M. J. Bau shows that British encroachments on Chinese territories were directed from the side of India, and were influenced by considerations of Indian policy. He quotes the statement of Bonar Law made in the House of Commons on November 27, 1911, who, while disclaiming that Britain has any desire for territorial acquisitions stated that there was one limitation on this principle. "There are certain places," he said, "lying next to British possessions or perhaps strategically commanding important British routes" which Great Britain could not see pass into other hands.

Pursuing this policy Great Britain seized Burma and Sikkim during the period when China was suffering the loss of her dependencies to various European nations, and at a later period she extended her influence over Tibet. In 1904 she entered into a treaty with Tibet which stipulated that British consent was to be obtained before any territorial concessions were made to any other power. In 1906 she signed a treaty with China in which she promised not to annex Tibetan territory; but by 1915, when she realized that Russia had established a joint sovereignty over Mongolia she demanded similar privileges in Tibet. This extension of British power at the expense of China has added immeasurably to the resources and wealth of the British Empire.

Sir Francis Younghusband in his work "Tibet and India" has given the full text of the Anglo-Tibetan Convention, and we quote Article IX, which throws light on the British policy towards China leading to annexation of Tibet, a province which in resources is equal to Mexico:

"The Government of Tibet engages that without the previous consent of the British Government:

"(a) No portion of Tibetan territory shall be ceded, sold, leased, mortgaged or otherwise given for occupation to any foreign Power.

"(b) No such Power shall be permitted to intervene in Tibetan affairs.

"(c) No representative or agent of a Foreign Power shall be admitted to Tibet.

"(d) No concession for railways, roads, telegraphs, mining or other rights, shall be granted to any Foreign Power or to the subject of any Foreign Power. In the event of consent to such concessions being granted, similar or equivalent concessions shall be granted to the British Government.

"(e) No Tibetan revenues, whether in kind or in cash, shall be pledged or assigned to any Foreign Power, or to the subject of any Foreign Power." " "

These demands certainly beat the so-called Twenty-one Demands of Japan to China, and Sir Francis explains that Britain had to take this step to protect India from Russian aggression through Tibet.

China has suffered a good deal at the hands of the British nation. The encroachments on China were directed from India and inspired by the purpose of strengthening the British hold on India. Land and sea-routes between Suez and Hong Kong must be under British control.

Britain is working for the realm between Suez and South China, although it is not apparent to ordinary observers. The following extracts from the eminent British statesman, geographer and gold-medallist of the British Royal Geographical Society, Sir Archibald Colquhoun, in his various works, will give some light on the subject :

"In order to defend her Asiatic interests, Europe [really England] can no longer depend exclusively on the Suez Canal line of communication. She needs also a more fully developed overland route—a railway line through Mesopotamia—and this not only for political but for commercial reasons.... By developing these regions, Europe would be merely advancing her commercial interests ; for this purpose, almost as much as for the political reasons, it is necessary to combat Russian policy. Between the Mediterranean and the Indian frontier, lawlessness and oppression at present prevail ; and the introduction of a more *civilized control* is a necessity of the age, and would be welcome at large...." ⁹ *

He further adds :

"When Russia is extending her lines from the Caspian to Afghanistan and the Persian

⁹ * COLQUHOUN, SIR ARCHIBALD : *Russia against India*, p. 227

Gulf, and through China to the Yangtze valley, Britain cannot afford to sit still looking always for immediate results. She would reply by a direct overland line from Quetta to Seistan and thence via Kerman to Ispahan, Mosul and onward with branches." 99

Regarding Britain's policy of controlling south-western China to safeguard her hold in India, he says :

"And what will be the effect if this process be continued until one day Russia is mistress of China, as well as paramount in Afghanistan and Persia? On the north-eastern frontier Britain can only defend India by introducing a counterbalance in China itself, by developing the Yangtze basin, which contains the greater part of the resources of the Empire and half its population, and by controlling South-western China, where lies the access to Burma and through Burma to India. This would afford Britain a proper base and line of defence on the Upper Yangtze which, combined with her sea-power and the control of the great Chinese waterway, would enable her to hold her own." 100

99 COLQUHOUN, SIR ARCHIBALD: *Russia against China*, p. 225.

100 COLQUHOUN, SIR ARCHIBALD: *Overland to China*, pp. 458-459.

To insure Great Britain's virtual control over the region from Suez to South-western China, she has carried out a ruthless policy of subjugation against any nation, European, Asian, or African, which stood in her way. So far she has been successful, and invariably her success has been due to her command of India's man-power, her raw materials, and her strategic position. India has been instrumental in bringing sorrow and distress to Persia, Egypt, Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Tibet, Burma, Siam, China, Arabia, Turkey, and Mesopotamia. It is India's duty to help these nations in their struggle against imperialism as well as strive to throw off her own bonds.

In terms of past history and mutual interest India has many reasons for regarding China with sympathy and friendship. Indo-Chinese understanding for mutual security will eliminate all fears of Russian, British, Japanese, Turkish or any other imperialism, and its aggression against China and India.

CHAPTER TWELVE

ANGLO-AMERICAN RELATIONS AND INDIA

FAR-SIGHTED British statesmanship has long ago perceived that an Anglo-American Alliance is a great necessity for the preservation of the British Empire. Gordon Le Suer and Basil Williams in their works on Cecil Rhodes show that one of the political ideas which inspired him to establish the Rhodes Foundation was to bring about the political union of England and the United States of America. Andrew Carnegie, William T. Stead and others worked for the same purpose. Chamberlain, Balfour, Bryce and others are the exponents of the same idea. In America Choate, Mahan, Page, Root, Wilson, Lodge, Harvey, Hoover, Beck and innumerable lesser lights are working for the same end. The Sulgrave Institute of England and the Loyal Coalition of Boston and other organizations and foundations are busy influencing public sentiment in America toward closer union with England. England is

To insure Great Britain's virtual control over the region from Suez to South-western China, she has carried out a ruthless policy of subjugation against any nation, European, Asian, or African, which stood in her way. So far she has been successful, and invariably her success has been due to her command of India's man-power, her raw materials, and her strategic position. India has been instrumental in bringing sorrow and distress to Persia, Egypt, Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Tibet, Burma, Siam, China, Arabia, Turkey, and Mesopotamia. It is India's duty to help these nations in their struggle against imperialism as well as strive to throw off her own bonds.

In terms of past history and mutual interest, India has many reasons for regarding China with sympathy and friendship. Indo-Chinese understanding for mutual security will eliminate all fears of Russian, British, Japanese, Turkish or any other imperialism, and its aggression against China and India.

CHAPTER TWELVE

ANGLO-AMERICAN RELATIONS AND INDIA

FAR-SIGHTED British statesmanship has long ago perceived that an Anglo-American Alliance is a great necessity for the preservation of the British Empire. Gordon Le Suer and Basil Williams in their works on Cecil Rhodes show that one of the political ideas which inspired him to establish the Rhodes Foundation was to bring about the political union of England and the United States of America. Andrew Carnegie, William T. Stead and others worked for the same purpose. Chamberlain, Balfour, Bryce and others are the exponents of the same idea. In America Choate, Mahan, Page, Root, Wilson, Lodge, Harvey, Hoover, Beck and innumerable lesser lights are working for the same end. The Sulgrave Institute of England and the Loyal Coalition of Boston and other organizations and foundations are busy influencing public sentiment in America toward closer union with England. England is

convinced that the safety of the Empire will be very much jeopardized, if not endangered, if America be hostile to Britain's international policies. This feeling has become stronger since the World War. They all realize including Mr. Kipling, who derides America, that America saved the British Empire in 1917.

The argument they put forward for an Anglo-American Alliance can be summed up by the following brilliant quotations from eminent British writers:

"Far more immediately hopeful is the prospect that 'greater Britain' in the sense that Sir Charles Dilke first used the words—men of British origin at home or abroad, in all parts of the world where they have settled, ever growing in numbers and importance, as compared with the nations of Europe—will in future weigh the scales heavily in favour of world peace. The British Empire and the United States are the two great divisions of that people. If they can work together in hearty and perpetual alliance, there will be a greater safeguard for peace than the world has yet seen ¹⁰¹

Mr. Ellis Barker says:

"The hope to secure the peace of the world by arbitration, treaties or by some great international

¹⁰¹ ELLIOT: *Traditions of British Statesmanship*, p. 214

organization, such as a federation or a great league of nations, may prove an illusion. All attempts to eliminate war by mutual agreement among states have failed since the time when the Greek states created the Amphictyonic League. All efforts to link together the satisfied and land-hungry nations to combine them for the defence of the territorial status quo may prove futile. The peace of the world can easily be maintained not by creating an artificial and unnatural partnership which will break down at the first opportunity, but by creating a permanent partnership between the freedom-loving Anglo-Saxon nations which in addition have the advantage of belonging to the same race, of speaking the same language, of having the same ideals, the same laws and the same traditions. A British-American union devised for the protection of their possessions against foreign attack should be the most powerful instrument imaginable not only for protecting the future peace of the Anglo-Saxons but also for protecting the peace of the world." ¹⁰²

Mr. A. G. Gardiner argues that an Anglo-American combination makes America and Britain the supreme arbiters in world affairs:

¹⁰² BARKER, J. ELLIS: *Greater Problems of British Statesmanship* (1917), p. 431.

"They have the world at their feet. It will be what they choose to make it. Between them they rule, directly or indirectly, not much less than half the earth. They command practically the whole of the credit left in the world. Their supremacy in mere terms of force is unassailable. Their command of the sea is not merely complete: it is without the shadow of a challenge. They have the unequalled potentiality of great armistice. They possess the major part of the raw materials of the general life—wool, cotton, coal, iron, food. They represent, both mentally and physically, the highest standard of human efficiency extant. They possess the two greatest power-houses in the world. There is no other nation that approximates to their industrial capacity, more even than numbers in the field determining factor in modern warfare. Above all, the power of these two great commonwealths is realized power. It is not power (as in the case of Russia) which is latent and may be developed in a generation or generations. It dominates the globe.

"And it is not an extravagance to say that the capital problem of mankind is whether this domination is to be exercised in rivalry or in well-being of the world, or for selfish aggrandizement of the respective nations." ¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ GARDINER, A. G.: *The Anglo-American Future* (1920), p. 12

the question of unrestricted and equal opportunity of investing capital in British protectorates—all these afford causes of friction. So far the question of naval superiority has been temporarily solved by America's surrendering to Britain's claim at least for ten years. The question of the payment of debts has already created some animosity among the masses of the two nations. A shipping war is going on, and the United States Shipping Board is not willing to surrender America's mercantile strength; and if a ship-subsidy bill be passed in America, it will tend to increase friction in this field. Regarding the control of raw materials and markets, there is a good deal of ill-feeling between America and Britain because the latter has succeeded in excluding America from many important sections of the world where oil is abundant, in Mesopotamia, New Guinea, etc. The question of commercial monopoly by Britain in territories like the island of Nauru has created quite an unfriendly feeling among certain classes of American businessmen. America is financially the strongest nation in the world, and she is every day becoming more of an exporting nation. She wants equal opportunity for securing raw materials, selling finished products, and room for foreign investments. Will the competitive

capitalism of Britain and America quarrel? The cause of misunderstanding between Britain and America will be accentuated if Britain tries to practise all over her territories the doctrine of imperial preference. The question of imperial preference in India is being agitated and advocated by Britain, and in this connection will India secure a good deal of attention in the international outlook of America.

American political philosophy, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the greatest of political documents, is influencing India's struggle for freedom, as it has served as an impetus to establish a republic in China. America will find in India a friend of immense potential strength. But if an Anglo-American Alliance be the guiding principle of American international policy, is she then prepared to go to war to uphold British Imperialism? All Asia and such European nations as are suffering from British world domination will not look favourably on the proposed Anglo-American Alliance.

America, true to her tradition, of a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," should not under any circumstances ally herself with a nation keeping hundreds of millions under subjection.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

INDIA AND BRITISH MILITARISM

THE British Empire as constituted, scattered all over the world, must rely on naval and military force. Sir John Seeley says: "We found that the Government [of British India] did not rest, as in England, upon the consent of the people or of some native constituency which has created the government by a constitutional process... There is only one body of persons of which we can positively affirm that without its support the government could not stand; this is the army." ¹⁰⁵

India is kept under subjection through two forces: (1) Britain's ability to utilize India's man power and resources against India, and (2) Britain's ability to use the world's political forces in her favour through a series of alliances and understandings with other nations. To offset the first weapon used by Britain against Indian

¹⁰⁵ SEELEY, SIR JOHN: *The Expansion of England*, p. 318.

spirations has been applied the Progressive Non-co-operation movement in India. To offset and overcome the second means India needs to establish foreign relations of her own.

In this connection let it be clearly understood that one of the causes of failure in the struggle for independence of India in 1857 was the lack of foreign relations with various nations, such as Italy established during her struggle for independence. Though Azimullah Khan was in Turkey and Russia, and the understanding was that Persia would aid India, the aid did not come. Britain succeeded in securing Turkey's aid by playing the game of the Russian bogey during the Crimean War. In fact, it was the fear that Russia might thrust herself into India which induced Britain to enter the Crimean War on the side of Turkey. England influenced Turkey to such an extent that the Sultan issued a *firman* asking the Mahommedans of India, particularly the Nizam of Hyderabad, to aid Britain. This was very effective. Russia and Persia could not extend any aid to India because they were afraid of Turkey, supported by the European concert of Britain, France, Italy, and other nations.

In this connection it may be mentioned that during the European War the Indian revolutionists did their best to establish foreign relations

with various states of the world, as Benjamin Franklin and others tried to do on behalf of revolutionary America on the eve of the establishment of the United States of America. These very activities of the Indian revolutionists were probably the most important factors for Mr. Montagu's sanctioning so-called reforms. Lord Morley in his "Recollections" (Vol. II) makes it clear that he started the scheme of "rallying the moderates" by the Morley-Minto reform plan after the Indian revolutionary movement took a terroristic turn.

Regarding the rise of nationalist agitation for independence (1905) of India Viscount Morley says :

"It was among the students in parts of India that unrest specially prevails. That class was rapidly being drawn into something like a spirit of revolt against the British Government, and the movement was unmistakably coming to a head notably in Upper India. A feeling gained ground that the last twenty years have been a period of reaction and in combative repose, the idea of complete independence of England began to appeal to youthful imagination. This marked the line of cleavage between moderate and extremist in native party of reform...the political changes within the last dozen years were enor

mous, and though the mass of the people remained ignorant and unmoved, it would be a fatal mistake to suppose that the change was confined to the preachings of political agitators. The fairly educated Indians were thoroughly dissatisfied with the old order of things. The victories of Japan, the revolutionary movement in Turkey, China, Persia did not pass unobserved. A new and ominous suspicion that England had come to a stop in her liberating mission made way..."¹⁰⁶

The real motive of granting some reforms in India was not to give the people freedom, but to keep the moderates with the Government. Lord Morley says :

"In the first place it will tend to reconcile liberal opinion (not in party sense), here, and that is something. In the second place, it will make it easier for the Moderates to resist the Extremist attack. Such an attack is sure to come and it is our business, as I think, not to do anything, that will give substance to extremist taunts and reproach against their moderate opponents."¹⁰⁷

Today the majority of Indian nationalists under the unique leadership of Mahatma M. K. Gandhi are advocating non-violent non-co-operation to achieve Swaraj or Self-Rule. Today

¹⁰⁶ MORLEY, VISCOUNT JOHN : *Recollections* (Vol. II), p. 154.

¹⁰⁷ *IBID.*, p. 260.

there is no Germany challenging British world supremacy; neither France, Russia nor any other power is in a position to attack India successfully, and Japan is Britain's ally in the Orient. Yet Britain is piling up military expenditure in India, as General Rawlinson, the commander-in-chief of British forces plainly says, to avert a general national uprising. Thus India is facing the struggle against British militarism.

Taxation without representation is found in India. The English Government in India has increased the military expenditure, at the dictation of General Rawlinson, despite the opposition of the Indians in the so-called legislative council. The Indian members have nothing to say about the military expenditure of the land. The military expenditure of India is much more than double the naval and military expenditure of Japan.^{107a} It is over fifty per cent. of the revenue of the land. It has been increased from \$225,000,000 to over \$300,000,000

^{107a} India's military expenditure for the year 1921-1922 according to *The Statesman's Year Book*, 1922, is 663,110,000 rupees or 331,550,000 yen. According to the same authority Japan's naval expenditure for the same period was 60,842,000 yen, and military expenditure 93,939,000 yen, a total of 154,881,000 yen.

INDIA AND BRITISH MILITARISM

which means the total annual income of 30,000,000 starving people of India.

During the year 1921—1922 about 40,000 persons were arrested because of their political agitation. Under the administration of Lord Reading, even though a member of suffering race, he is carrying out the British imperialistic policy with greater sternness than any other British administrator. Britain is using Jewish intellects to govern the Orient. Readings, Montagues, Samuels are the leading lights of Zionism. Imperialistic designs of Great Britain must be successfully checked before India can be free. It is a matter of time when the whole world will wake up to the menace of British militarism, and India should take the lead to rouse the international conscience.

Britain's militarism, navalism and her determination to dominate the world depend upon her ability to utilize other powers to further her interest. This is British diplomacy. British diplomacy is at the zenith of its success. Today America, Japan, and all Europe are aiding British militarism positively and by indirect means under the guise of serving their own interest and preserving world peace. America is leaning to a pro-British policy, which may lead to an Anglo-American alliance

or understanding. In the debate regarding the Four Power Treaty, Senator Borah pointed out the possibilities and consequences of the Anglo-American Alliance. So far as the Pacific is concerned, Japan and France are bound to support Britain by the so-called Four Power Pact. Germany and Italy are playing into the hands of Britain because of the fear of French imperialism. Russia is catering to British diplomacy to bring France to terms. In spite of much talk of radicalism, of Soviet diplomacy, Russia is more occupied in preserving the Anglo-Russian trade agreement. Britain thus has made the Baltic and the Mediterranean British lakes. There is a good prospect for an Anglo-German-Russia-Japanese-American understanding to crown the success of British diplomacy and to strengthen British world domination through her navalism, militarism, and air forces. This is the real world menace which is facing the world, particularly Asia and India. This is the real nature of British peril which India will have to fight, unless something happens to defeat British diplomacy.

Europe of today is more or less a vassal to Britain and she will remain so until the continental European statesmen pay heed to the

sound policy once outlined by the great Russian statesman, Count Witte, in his "Memoirs," to the effect that friendly understanding must be brought about between France and Germany through the good offices of Russia, which must not be a tool of Britain. Then there will arise a Continental *bloc*¹⁰ of Russia, Germany and France which will draw in Italy and Spain, for no other purpose than to check the British policy of keeping Continental Europe divided to further Britain's imperial designs.

This will bring comparative peace in Europe and this will force Japan to give up her relations

o : Count Witte said to Ex-Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany :—
 "Your Majesty, picture a Europe which does not waste most of its blood and treasure on competition between individual countries, which does not maintain millions of soldiers for internecine wars, which is not an armed camp with each country pitted against its neighbour, a Europe which is in brief one body-politic, one large empire. Then of course we should be richer, and more vigorous, more cultured and Europe, instead of withering under the burden of strife, would become truly the mistress of the world. To achieve this ideal, we must seek to create a solid union of Russia, Germany and France. Once those countries are firmly united, all the other states of the European continent will no doubt join the central alliance and thus form an all-embracing continental confederation, which will free Europe from the burden of internecine competition and establish its domination over the world for many years to come."

—Yarmolinsky, Abraham: *The Memoirs of Count Witte*, p. 409.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

with Britain; and America will not favour an Anglo-American Alliance against the whole world to uphold British imperialism in Europe, Asia and Africa. The Indian statesmen, conscious of the ultimate fight between British militarism and navalism and the rising democracy in India, should interest themselves to bring about active co-operation with those European and other statesmen who are not anxious to subscribe to the ideal of world peace under British domination.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

RECENT ASPECTS OF BRITAIN'S INDIAN POLICY

THE British policy of the retention of India and British possession of all approaches to India was written into the Treaty of Peace with Germany at the conclusion of the World War. For the security of India she made a protectorate of Egypt, secured mandates in Palestine, Arabia and Mesopotamia, and created the state of the Hedjaz.

During the Anglo-French controversy which arose out of circumstances attendant on the Washington Conference, Earl Curzon stated that Britain must not allow any nation to be supreme in the Middle East, and thus jeopardize the control of the route to India.

The Washington Conference was likewise influenced by considerations arising out of Britain's interest in India. Britain desired the support of the United States and Japan and, if possible, of France in supporting her Asian

Empire. On the other hand, she would have been apprehensive of an alliance between France and Japan, because such a combination linked up with the nationalist movement in India would create very serious difficulties for Britain. The Four Power Pact safeguards the British position in the Orient no less satisfactorily than did the Anglo-Japanese Alliance which it supercedes. The Rt. Hon. Srinivas Sastri, an agent of the British Government, representing the British in India, was brought to Washington as a symbol of Indian participation in the Conference in an official manner.

The Anglo-French ill-feeling at the Washington Conference was due in part to Britain's firm stand against France's Oriental Policy, which is very prejudicial to British interests. France supported the Kemalist Government against Greece, the tool of Britain. Britain wants to weaken Turkey, whereas France is in favour of maintaining Turkey in Asia Minor as it is clear that behind the expansion of Greece lay the British design to dominate the Middle East and the Mediterranean. Britain desires no nation challenging her position between the Suez Canal and India.

Anglo-French relations became strained when French demanded a navy equal to that of Japan.

In a secret session, Mr. Balfour opposed France's demand and spoke in unmistakable terms. He pointed out that if France wished to have a navy equal to that of Japan, Great Britain would support Italy. In that case the combined naval forces of France and Italy would be superior to those of Great Britain in the Mediterranean, and thus endanger Britain's control of the sea-route to India via the Suez Canal. Britain's opposition to a large submarine tonnage was dictated in part by apprehension of the damage that this type of vessel could inflict, endangering the route to India.

It was for the sake of Indian security that Britain made a compromise with Ireland. It is because of India that Britain has given so much consideration to Egypt. It is the question of imperial interests in India that caused Britain to strive for an understanding with Afghanistan. It is because of India that Britain shows an apparently conciliatory spirit towards the Arabs, at the same time establishing military air routes from Alexandria to Karachi. It is to strengthen her position in India that Britain has taken Tibet within her fold and is continually encroaching in Southern China and the Malayan Peninsula, by building impregnable naval bases, particularly at Singapore.

Before making trade agreement with Soviet Russia, Britain extracted a promise from her that there would be no Russian menace, direct or indirect, to India. As one of the conditions of British recognition of Soviet Russia at the Genoa Conference, Britain demanded that Russia should not distribute propaganda material in India. It is with India in mind that Britain is talking of certain revisions in the Treaty of Sevres, on the theory that the Bosphorus will remain in her control, and that there will be no Russian menace through a Russo-Turkish, or Russo-Turkish-French understanding. The recent treaty of Rappallo was most disquieting, for it brings on the stage of world politics a potential land force, the greatest of modern history, to oppose Britain's sea power. The drama may be fought out in Central Asia.

The nations of the world who have relations with Britain's world policies are watching India's march towards her absolute independence, for a free India would mean, not only a change in the map of Asia, but a change in the political map of Europe.

While some of the Indian statesmen continue to think and work in terms of India within the Empire of Great Britain, independent nations are not interested in aiding India to achieve the

status of a dominion. No nation which fears British world supremacy would care to aid any movement in India which is directed towards strengthening the British imperial system, through the establishment of a self-governing dominion in India.

Free from British control, India would have remarkable possibilities of economic development. In discussing the coal and iron situation in the world, Mr. Ellis Barker states that India has more iron resources than China and it may be that they are equal to those of all other countries of Asia. It is needless to emphasize that an India with coal resources of no less than 79,000,000,000 ton and with actual reserves of iron amounting to 65,000,000 tons and potential reserves of 250,000,000 tons as estimated by Mr. Barker, is of great interest to industrial countries. A free India would mean commercial possibilities in a land which is now practically controlled by a British monopoly.

The nations which would be interested in the Indian independence movement are those which are in close competition with Britain in world politics and commerce. At present, the United States, Japan and France are in a position to have an independent foreign policy if they choose, without fearing very much from Great

Britain. It is the policy of Britain to tie up these Powers so that they will not develop an independent foreign policy which might threaten her interests. Next come Italy, Germany and Russia. Britain court them in such a way that they will probably remain subservient to her policies for some time. Nevertheless, Indian statesmen who realize the Indian position in world politics should endeavour to establish independent foreign relations with all these powers. The political pendulum of international politics is always on the swing, and there is no doubt that there will be constant change of policy among nations. Indian statesmen should be active in establishing understandings with those powers whose interests it will be to aid India against Britain's domination. Britain holds India through India's isolation in world politics. No Indian statesman with a conscience, can ignore the fact that India has been the means of enslavement of various nations in Asia and Africa. It is a matter of duty for India so to act that through her efforts and the new orientation of world politics these nations will be free.

India will fall short of her own ideals if political independence of India does not breathe the idealism of "Rajdharm," (ruling based upon the creed of righteousness). Peace on earth and good

will to men should be the guiding principle of Indian statesmanship; and with that idealism they should take a stand in world politics. A republic in India will be in favour of the doctrine that all nations should be free to work out their destinies without external interference. A republic in India will be a factor in bringing about world peace.

mortgaged their crops and their bit of land, are sold by the tax-collector to wander about until they drop of starvation. . . . We send shiploads of grain to India, but there is plenty of grain in India. The trouble is the people have been ground down until they are too poor to buy it. Famine is chronic there now, though the same shipments of foodstuffs are made annually to England, the same drainage of millions of dollars goes on every year..." ¹¹⁰

The real motive of the British rule in India and its effects upon the Indian people has been described by Dr. Paul S. Reinsch, formerly American Minister to China and once head of the Department of Political Science in the University of Wisconsin, in his "Intellectual and Political Currents in the Far East." He says :

"The present situation in India illustrates some of the unfortunate results of the political dependence of a civilized people. Not only politically, but also in economic matters, India is kept in a state of dependence on the metropole. But the most hopeless feature of the situation is that the men who would naturally be leaders in government and enterprises, find themselves excluded from opportunities for ex-

¹¹⁰ From a speech in the Bar Association Club House, New York, quoted in the Public, November 20, 1908.

exercising legitimate power in their own country. Such a decapitation of an entire people is a great sacrifice to impose, even in return for the blessings of peace and an efficient policing of the country. The continuance of this policy would mean either the total destruction and degradation of Indian national life, or the end of the British Raj."

About the evil effects of the British rule in India, Mr. Fielding-Hall, once a British Civil Servant in India, has said :

"It [discontent] is universal, in all provinces, in all classes, directed not against this act or that act, but against the government as a whole. . . . And this discontent is not sudden. It has grown slowly for many years. . . . India feels uncomfortable, and clamours for anything she can get. The Indian Government gives what it can, offering profusest condolence, which is sincere; and for the rest sitting on the chest. . . . Man is gregarious, and he is so made that he cannot fully develop himself except in large and again larger communities. To reach his full stature in any way, he must develop in all ways. He must feel himself part of ever greater organisms, the village first, the district and the nation—finally of humanity. But in India all this is impossible. Except the village, there is no community that

exists even in name, and we have injured, almost destroyed even that. Thus an Indian has no means of growth. He cannot be a citizen of anything at all. Half his sympathies and abilities lie entirely fallow, therefore he cannot fully develop the other half. . . . In some ways the educated classes feel it most. Elsewhere, they see men of their class cultivating their patriotism, increasing that sense of being and work for others, of being valuable to the world at large, showing capacity for leading, ruling, thinking, advancing in a thousand ways, while none of it is for them. They want to express the genius of their races in wider forms than mere individuality, but they are not able to do so. They want a national science and literature and law ; they cannot have it. No individual as an individual can achieve anything. Not till he feels he is a cell in a greater and more enduring life, can he develop. But this is not for India. . . .” 111

From the moral point of view Britain, in keeping India in subjection, has contributed to the degeneration of a people. Gandhi and his followers rightly hold that British Government in India, in its totality, has done more harm to India than any previous system. “India is less manly under the British rule than she ever was before.”

111 FIELDING-HALL, H.: *The Passing of Empire*, pp. 4-28.

INDIA A WORLD POWER—THE FUTURE

Various aspects of the effect of India under British rule affecting the world at large have been already discussed. In the past most of the European and other wars in which Britain was involved, were due to India more than to any other factor.

"In tracing the expansion of the British Empire from 1815 to 1878, the dominant considerations were India and trade-routes from England to India, from India to other colonies, and from other colonies to India. If we bear these facts in mind we shall be able to discern the motives and the course of empire-building and British participation in international affairs."¹¹²

The British Empire will in future face more wars because every effort for retaining India within the empire, and offsetting designs of other powers against India will create more international complications. In fact, the present grave situation in the Near East and Britain's aggressive attitude to make the Mediterranean a British lake and control the Black Sea primarily is for safe-guarding India. Britain's Mesopotamian policy where "government by bombs from aeroplanes" is being carried on, is due to the idea of keeping India within the empire. Present Anglo-

¹¹² GIBBONS, HERBERT ADAMS : *Introduction to World Politics*,

French rivalry in Asia Minor has much to do with Britain's control of India. Anglo-Russian relations are so much tinged with India that whenever Britain talks to Russia even on trade relations, she asks the Soviet Government not to threaten her in India.

If India be free and independent, then quarrels of European imperialisms will have less possibility of extending their vast scope to Asia. If there should be a war among European nations regarding the mastery over the Near East, Britain will not be likely to plunge into a struggle unless she is forced to do so to protect India, neither would it be possible for her to carry on the struggle unless she is sure of Indian aid. If India refuses to fight for Britain then Britain's attitude in the Near East will be more temperate. In fact, the modification of the British attitude towards Turkey is largely due to Indian agitation. If India agrees to fight for Britain then her attitude will be more uncompromising, and there may be a war in the Near East which Britain may win by mustering millions of Indian soldiers and using American money to equip them. Control of India, her immense man power, resources, and strategic position tempt Britain to extend her mastery over all South Asia refusing equal rights to other nations, which

INDIA A WORLD POWER—THE FUTURE

assure source of international irritation leading to war.

If India remains within the British Empire, directly and indirectly she will have to bear the consequences of British foreign policy. Under the present circumstances, unless there be a revolution against Britain, India as a part of the British Empire has no other alternative than to go to war if the British statesmen feel that they should, to preserve imperial interest, fight France, Russia, Turkey, or any other nation. But there is not the least doubt that India will be greatly benefitted by preserving friendly relations with these nations. As long as India remains a part of the British Empire she will have to suffer and will not have freedom and opportunity to lend her strength and influence to the cause of world peace, at least peace in Asia. To remain within the British Empire is not desirable for the people of India for the same reason as it is not desirable for Britain to be a part of the French empire or America to be a part of the Japanese Empire with a status of a self-governing colony.

But it will be argued that India needs British protection from foreign aggression. A free India will be able to take care of herself militarily from foreign invasion. Regarding the military

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

INDIA A WORLD POWER—THE FUTURE

As India is the pivot of the British Empire which looms very large in world affairs—politically, economically and industrially, any change in India must affect the British Empire and the world for good or evil. The question of the future of India, even if it does not affect the outside world, cannot be ignored because it is a problem which concerns one-fifth of the population of the world.

There are several possibilities for the future of India:

1. By using force, India may be kept in subjection for some time, without any voice in the direction of her own affairs.

2. India may be conquered by some other powers defeating Britain.

3. India may enjoy as much self-government as is consistent with the interest of the British imperial system.

4. India may become free and independent from all foreign yokes, and establish a Federated Republic of the United States of India.

Taking the first possibility we recognize two aspects of the continuation of the British rule in India. (a) Its effect upon the people of India, (b) its effect upon the world at large. It is often argued by those who support British rule in India that India is not fit for self-government. This is an argument of imperialists of all ages against a people kept in subjection. This argument was used by the Austrians against Italy, Poland and other countries,—but the Austrian Empire fell and upon its ruins many independent nations have arisen. India is now in subjection ; but for centuries she governed herself, which indicates that the ability for self-government is not lacking in the people. It is true that India will make mistakes as all governments, including the Government of Great Britain, make mistakes. It has been well said by Lord Meston, "Mistakes there must be, for by mistakes is the truest experience gained."

Indeed, there may come temporary chaos in India during the period of transition when the country is to emerge from foreign rule to her absolute independence, but this can never be the justification for continuation of British rule in

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

India, because a *good* government inspired from without, can never be a true substitute for *self*-government even if bad.

At the most, what Mr. Bertrand Russell has to say regarding the present chaotic condition in China may be applicable to India.

"The English in the seventeenth century, the French in the eighteenth, the Americans in the nineteenth and the Russians in our own day have passed through years of anarchy and civil war, which were essential to their development, and could not have been curtailed by outside interference without great detriment to the final solution. So it is with China, if they are let alone they will in the end find a solution suitable to their character, which we should certainly not do. A solution slowly reached by themselves may be stable, whereas one prematurely imposed by outside powers will be artificial and therefore unstable." ¹⁰⁹

Again, it must not be forgotten that British Government, in India is not a good government, and it stands condemned before the world because its principle motive has been profit in preference to the benefit of the people of India and fitting them for self-government. The very fact of

¹⁰⁹ RUSSEL, BERTRAND : *The Problem of China* (1922 pp. 187-188.

neglect of education and long exclusion of the people of India from responsible positions in the government of India makes the charge conclusive.

Regarding the British misrule of India, Rev. Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall, late President of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, and Burrows Lecturer on the Orient has remarked:

"There is no denying the fact that England is administering India for England's benefit and not India's. It is hard for me to say this, because until I went to India my sympathies were all on the English side. My early education was much in England and I have many dear personal friends there. But what I am saying now is the truth, and the truth must be told. . . . The obvious fact stares us in the face that there is at no time, in no year, any shortage of food-stuffs in India. The trouble is that the taxes imposed by the British Government being fifty per cent. of produce, the Indian starves that England's annual revenue may not be diminished by a dollar. Eighty per cent. of the whole population has been thrown back upon the soil because England's discriminating duties have ruined practically every branch of native manufacture; and these tillers of the soil, when they have sold themselves for the last time to the money-lender, when they have over and over again

possibilities of a free India, General Sir Ian Hamilton declares :

“There is material in the north of India, sufficient and fit, under good leadership, to shake the artificial society of Europe to its foundation once it dares to tamper with that militarism which now alone supplies it with any higher ideal than money and the luxury which that money can purchase. It is heroism, self-sacrifice and chivalry which redeem war and build up national character. What part do these heroic qualities find in the ignoble struggle between nations for commercial supremacy, with stock exchanges and wheat-pits for their battlefields? If then it is a question of finding leaders, a gradual diffusion of knowledge will produce those leaders, and once they have been found, how can England hope to retain under the British crown this vast empire permanently—unless the Indians are exactly in the same position of independence as Canadians and Australians today occupy ?” ¹¹

The second possibility, that of India being conquered by any other power may be dismissed briefly. Such a contingency would not be favoured by the Indian people. Under the changed world conditions, it is not possible that any out-

¹¹ Footnote to page 210 of *Japan's Foreign Policy* by A. M. POOLEY.

side power can successfully invade India today. Soviet Russia, single-handed, is not in a position to invade India, and in fact its present policy, for its own self-interest, is to be on friendly terms with all nations, particularly the people of India. Afghanistan, Persia or Turkey lacks the power to conquer India. In fact, it is Indian man-power, arms and ammunitions that defeated Germany during the World War. Germany is crippled and India has no fear from her. France has her problems in Germany, African colonies, Asia Minor to keep her occupied. France found it hard to keep Syria under control without Turkey's support, and had to secure Turkish friendship to preserve her own interest in Asia Minor. Japan has her own problems in China and Eastern Asia. Japan's international position is not very enviable, because at any time she may be isolated in world politics, unless she has the support of Britain and America. Far-sighted Japanese have recognized the mistakes of the invasion of Siberia and aggression in Shantung, and the Japanese Government is re-tracing its steps towards peaceful relations. Under these circumstances Japan's coming to India to establish a dependency in place of England is rather fantastic. It is needless to add that there is no fear of American invasion of India.

Regarding the third alternative, that India may enjoy self-government within the empire some of the British statesmen see clearly that the Indian people must have some voice in the self-government of their country, otherwise Britain may lose India. Recognizing the gross mistakes of the past, they are now addressing themselves to bring about changes in British administration in India. They hold that the Government of India Act of December, 1919, is the beginning of an experiment which will ultimately lead India to be a real partner of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Some of them argue that the time has already come when India should have the status of Canada, Australia or other self-governing dominions. This point of view is presented by Mr. Putnam Weale :

"It must be undoubted that long ago the advisability of interesting India as a world power would have been apparent if the future had been properly studied; if men could have looked boldly over little internal complications, and seen the relations which India really bore to the chaotic regions reaching straight to the Mediterranean ... But has not the time already arrived when India should be entitled to create a navy when as the country grows in political understanding should steadily grow in strength? Let us boldly

sk, would not the flying of an Indian naval flag in the Persian Gulf, in the Arabian Sea, and even in the Mediterranean, not only animate the breast of Indian patriots, but convince all Europe and Asia that a new giant has grown up—a giant, no longer the helot of England, but England's real ally? Would not the politics of Afghanistan, of Persia, of Arabistan, and of Turkey—not to speak of that of which Egypt is the principle part—be enormously influenced, sooner or later by such a tremendous factor? . . . More important to India, both nationally and imperially, than any question of the adjacent seas is the question of adjacent lands. . . . Since it is an axiom that no power can be allowed to advance to the head of the Persian Gulf, it is high time that the future of the great plateau of Iran were considered. Why cannot a stream of Indian emigration be directed to that region—why cannot some policy more intelligent than the present one be attempted? Irrigation and the hand of Indian cultivators could regain vast regions which today are virtually deserts; schemes are feasible which would bring not only profit but honour; and by interesting the Indian people in great schemes beyond their own borders, giving them an inkling of what their future may be as a colonizing race—instead of organized outrage being an

ideal, there would come a speedy appreciation of the fact that a new era had dawned in which bombs had no legitimate place at all. . . . Abandoning all ambiguity it is abundantly clear that India's real future lies not only in industrialism—the factory servitude as some preach, but in territorial expansion; that is to say, racial expansion. That this will inevitably come some day is quite clear; but whether there will be in political tomorrow English statesmen able and fit to direct that expansion in such a manner that it partakes of the nature of natural migratory movement such as the movement of the English race to Canada, seems today doubtful. Yet India's horizon must be broadened; some compensation must be found for the restriction of Indian immigration to Africa and to America; in a word, that a new field for an overflow of swarming population must be marked down, so that virtual sterilization and stagnation do not at least become a new political menace—this admits no longer of any doubt. In the last analysis, only by such a policy will it be possible to secure not only the shores and hinterlands of the Persian Gulf, but the future balance of power in Asia.”¹¹⁴

¹¹⁴ WEALE, B. L. PUTNAM: *Conflict of the Color*, pp. 210—214

This is a dream of Greater India under the British imperial system. Mrs. Annie Besant has similar dreams regarding India to protect British imperial interest in China and all over eastern Asia. The late Hon. G. K. Gokhale held that India will not only protect British interest in Asia and the Mediterranean, but will have a special sphere of interest in Africa. The constitution of the British Empire and the character of its different members make it impossible for the British to grant full dominion status to India. This would mean that India should assume an equal position with all British dominions. So long as it is the settled policy that the people of India must not be allowed to enjoy political and social equality with the British, self-government to India has no real meaning. Today the policy of discrimination against the people of India within the British Empire serves a precedent against their enjoying equal liberty in all lands as do Englishmen, Americans or Frenchmen. India under the present condition has nothing to gain by remaining within the empire.

Finally, then, the only alternative left is not in India under the British Empire, but a Republic of the United States of India. India must be the mistress of her destiny, and she should

create such conditions as will enable her to throw her weight in international politics on the side of human liberty and justice.

Many people consider that on the whole the British Empire has been a great factor for the progress of the human race. To them anything that will curb the power and position of the British Empire is not desirable. They become horrified at the idea of India's separation from the British imperial system. However, they should not forget that a similar feeling prevailed towards the Roman Empire which preserved the Roman peace for the world. Old Empires will fall and new powers will rise, as it has been the case in the past; and the human race will march on towards progress in spite of many changes. The World War has shorn Germany of her colonial empire, and Russia has lost many of her dependencies, but these are not irreparable calamities for the world, but will be for the good of humanity in the long run. So separation of India from the British Empire, will not destroy England; it will not cripple the British people in furthering the cause of human progress, but, on the contrary, will eliminate much evil due to Britain's imperialism, centred in India.

Regarding the present struggle and the future of India, Pandit Jawharlal Nehru, during his arrest and trial on the charge of criminal intimidation, made the following illuminating statement before the Court, on June 17, 1922 :

"England is a mighty country with her armies and navies but today she is confronted with some things that are mightier. Her armies and navies have to face the suffering and self-sacrifice of a nation determined to be free and no man can doubt what the issue of such a struggle must be. We are fighting for our freedom, for the freedom of our country and faith. We desire to injure no nation. We wish to have no dominion over others, but we must be free in our own country. . . . I have said many hard things about the British Government, but, for one thing, however, I must offer my grateful thanks ; for it has given us a chance of fighting in this most glorious struggle and surely few people have had such an opportunity given them. The greater our suffering, the more difficult the tests we have to pass, the more splendid will be the future of India. India has not survived through thousands of years to go down now. England has not sent her (India's) noblest and best twenty-

five thousand of her sons to the jails to give up the struggle. No, India's future is assured. Some men and women of little faith doubt and hesitate occasionally, but those who have vision can almost see the glory that will be India's."

India, the greater India, is a fact today, for her children are now scattered to the seven corners of the world, but they are treated as slaves and the title of an Indian of however high standing is no better than that of a coolie. Today every Indian is marked with the badge of slavery, and slaves cannot command due respect and equal opportunity. Freedom, absolute independence must be achieved so that hundreds of millions of people in India may contribute their fullest expression of manhood and womanhood, and work for human liberty and world peace.

So far as we can judge, India has a higher destiny than merely to be a factor in the British imperial system, providing balance of power in Asia, Africa, or Europe to Britain's advantage. Her future is to play a role in world politics independently. European balance of power will be influenced by the Federated Republic of the United States of India, free from all foreign control, because all nations will have indepen-

lent relations with free India and the magnitude of Indian support politically and economically will not be a negligible factor.

China and India lived for more than three thousand years without a war. If China and India can co-operate, it is quite feasible that it will bring about a new peaceful equilibrium of Asia, if not the world. A free India will co-operate with all nations, not excluding England. It may be that if British policy changes and there be common interest of preserving peace between the United States of India and England there will be co-operation. If the Republic of India does not embark on an imperialistic policy of her own, she will serve as a check against any aggression against China, Persia and other nations. If Japan gives up her imperialistic scheme it is not too much to think that there can be Indo-Japanese co-operation to preserve peace in Asia. The Republic of India will be on the friendliest terms with the United States of America, the greatest of all republics, and this will help to insure better understanding between the nations of the world.

World peace is India's ideal. Mr. C. R. Das, the President of the All India National Congress of 1923, speaks for India when he says :

“India stands for world peace. World peace in my mind means the freedom of every nationality, and I go farther and say that no nation on the face of the earth can be really free when the other nations are in bondage.”

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

EGYPTIAN INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

Great Britain, under the pressure of the Egyptian national movement and international public opinion, has theoretically acknowledged the independence of Egypt; but in actual practice Egypt's sovereignty is limited. Under the garb of protecting the interests of foreigners, the British Government maintains the right to interfere in Egypt's internal affairs. Great Britain infringes upon Egypt's territorial sovereignty by maintaining British troops on Egyptian soil. Lastly, Egypt does not enjoy the freedom of carrying on foreign relations to promote her interests. The late Zaglul Pasha tried his best to come to an understanding to Great Britain on the main principles.

The late Zaglul Pasha during his conference with the Rt. Hon. J. Ramsay MacDonald tried his best to come to an understanding with Great Britain, on the fundamental principles

approval of Great Britain and the Egyptian diplomatic representatives abroad not to follow a policy contrary to that of Great Britain.

(g) All foreign officers employed in the Egyptian Army to be British, and its armament and training to be same as in British Army.

(h) The present police arrangements to be maintained until the reform of the Capitulations.

(i) The Financial and Judicial Advisers to remain, and the European Department of the Ministry of the Interior to retain its present status until the reform of Capitulations.

(j) Great Britain to retain the duty of protecting foreign interests in Egypt.

(k) The system established in 1899 to remain in force in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and Great Britain to guarantee Egypt her present and future water requirements.²

Even a cursory study of the above points makes it absolutely clear that the so-called proposal of concluding a Treaty of Alliance between Great Britain and Egypt was a clever and disguised move to legalise a British protectorate over Egypt with the sanction of the Egyptian National Assembly and Egyptian Government, which will have the binding force of a solemn covenant freely accepted by the Egyptians. The

² The Times Weekly Edition (London) March 8, 1928

gyptian nationalists did not want to become a party to any treaty which will perpetuate British control over Egyptian internal affairs, national defense and foreign relations; so they have very properly and unceremoniously rejected the British offer.

The British Government was not sure that the Egyptian nationalists could be duped by the above agreement for establishing British protectorate over Egypt. So in his communications of March 1, 1928, to the British High Commissioner in Egypt, Sir Austen Chamberlain instructed him, "in the event of the failure of the negotiations for an Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of Alliance, to remind the Government of Egypt that the British Government would not permit the discharge of its responsibility for the protection of foreigners in Egypt to be endangered by Egyptian legislation." ³ Lord Lloyd, the British High Commissioner in Egypt communicated the above wishes of the British Government to the Egyptian authorities on March 4, 1928. But Government of Nahas Pasha passed a new Public Meetings Bill, ignoring the British objections to it and protesting against Great Britain's "perpetual interference with the internal conduct of Egyptian affairs, paralysing

³ The Egyptian Situation—An Editorial, published in Times (London) of April 21. 1928

the exercise by Egyptian Parliament of its right to legislate and to control legislation." The British Government, determined to uphold British overlordship in Egypt ordered the powerful British fleet to proceed to Egypt to enforce its demands. The Egyptian Government, to avoid further British invasion of Egypt, had to abandon the enforcement of the Public Meetings Bill. The British Government, after securing the status quo of the situation, has adopted a policy of watchful waiting in Egypt. The failure of the designs of the British foreign Office (the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of Alliance) and the later development, with British gun-boat diplomacy in Egypt, marks the beginning of a new stage of struggle for Egyptian Independence. It is needless to emphasise that the international situation will greatly influence the outcome of the struggle of the Egyptian nationalists.

Today, as a matter of general principles, Great Britain, France, Italy and Spain, to preserve their North African colonial empires, are agreed to follow a uniform policy of keeping the North African peoples under subjection. It is regarded by many well-informed students of world politics that the recent satisfactory solution of the Tangier question between France and Spain, and the announcement of a Four Power Conference

EGYPTIAN INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

between France, Spain, Great Britain and Italy, indicate a growing solidarity of these great European Powers on the problems affecting their mutual interests on North Africa. This attitude of four great Powers of Europe will undoubtedly affect adversely Egyptian efforts for securing national independence.

On the other hand the recent Wahabi attack on Iraq, which is virtually a British protectorate, has created some embarrassment for Britain ; because a successful attack on Iraq would mean a blow to Britain's prestige in the Middle East, which in turn will hurt French prestige in Syria. The following views expressed in the French Press shows French apprehension and solicitude for an Anglo-French understanding against the Pan-Islamists in Asia and Africa :—

“The Pan-Islamic agitation, the Gaulois says, is not the purely religious movement which it has sometimes been called. Though the Wahabis claim direct descent from the Prophet, they are not indifferent to the material and moral support of the Egyptians, of the Angora Government, or of Moscow. The tribes have plenty of arms, munitions and money, and are cleverly worked upon by foreign agents. There is an evident connection between the agitations, anti-British today, anti-European tomorrow, in

Islam, in Egypt and India. Illusions on this subject, says the Gaulois, would be dangerous. Sooner or later the solidarity which should exist between European nations with interests in Mahomedan countries, though very long neglected in France and still more in Great Britain, will become a necessary measure of self-defence unless the awakening of Islam is to develop into a movement of which the consequences cannot be foreseen. Wisonian principles of self-government have caused deep disturbances in countries where populations, whose only industry is war, are constantly at daggers drawn. The evil is growing, and if European representatives at Geneva, in their pre-occupation with disarmament, lose sight of it, France will run a grave risk of being driven from the foothold which it still has in the East.

"The Temps places Ibn Saud's declaration of war in relation to the refusal of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty by the Wafd. Taken together it considers that these two questions are the beginning of a concerted action by the forces of Islam against British policy in the Near East. The Temps considers it impossible for the British Government to make any further concessions to Egypt, if the safety of the Empire is to be maintained. 'In attacking Iraq and

'Transjordonia', the new paper continues, 'Ibn Saud evidently intends to strike the British power at its weakest point.' Further, the attribution of Mosul to Iraq has left a bitterness in certain Turkish quarters which may be tempted to take advantage of the present circumstances to create trouble for Great Britain." ⁴

British authorities are deeply concerned with the possible development of the agitation of boycotting the recently appointed Royal Commission (the so-called Simon Commission) to investigate the present condition in India. If the Indian nationalist agitation to boycott this Royal Commission and to start a movement for a nation-wide Civil Disobedience or General Strike succeeds, it will have its effects in Egypt and the Near East in general. None should forget that in a real crisis in the Near East and Egypt, Britain will be forced to fall back upon India's man-power, raw materials and strategic position, as she did, during the world war, to dismember the Ottoman Empire. British authorities are hoping that communal struggle between the Hindus and Moslems of India will prevent the Indian Nationalists from making their agita-

⁴ The Times (London) March 8, 1928.

tion effective. They are depending upon a section of Moslem Indian leaders (especially of the Punjab and Bengal) to support the British Indian Government against the Indian Nationalists. They are hoping that the demand of Moslem Indians will afford splendid opportunity to perpetuate "Communal Representation" which is bound to promote communal distrust and conflict and hinder the cause of national solidarity in India.

Many Moslem Indian supporters of the British autocracy in India are Pan-Islamists. However, it is a fact that for some peculiar reasons they do not seem to realise that India holds the key to the solution of international problems affecting the Far East, Central Asia, the Middle East and the Near East. They seem to ignore the fact that unless the people of India become masters of their own country and control India's Internal Affairs, National Defense and Foreign Policy, none of the Islamic countries, now under British control and domination, can ever assert their complete independence.

It may be safely asserted that as long as Britain holds India in subjection, she for the purpose of retaining control over the sea route to India, will maintain control over Egypt. Thus some day after the Indian people will recover

their national freedom, the final act of Egypt's struggle for independence may be enacted in India. In this connection it should be noted that not only the All India National Congress, during the last session held at Madras, adopted a resolution in favour of Egyptian independence, but also Hon. Pandit Moti Lal Nehru (a Hindu), one of the foremost leaders of the All India National Congress and the leader of the Swarajist Party in Indian Legislative Assembly, has recently declared that the Indian and Egyptian nationalists should act in concert against British Imperialism, to regain their national independence. This proposal of Indo-Egyptian co-operation may not immediately materialise, but it is undoubtedly full of serious possibilities, because it represents the spirit of co-operation among the most advanced political thinkers of the oppressed nations of the Orient against their alien rulers.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

“India stands for world peace. World peace, in my mind means the freedom of every nationality, and I go farther and say that no nation on the face of the earth can be really free when the other nations are in bondage.”

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

EGYPTIAN INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

Great Britain, under the pressure of the Egyptian national movement and international public opinion, has theoretically acknowledged the independence of Egypt; but in actual practice Egypt's sovereignty is limited. Under the garb of protecting the interests of foreigners, the British Government maintains the right to interfere in Egypt's internal affairs. Great Britain infringes upon Egypt's territorial sovereignty by maintaining British troops on Egyptian soil. Lastly, Egypt does not enjoy the freedom of carrying on foreign relations to promote her interests. The late Zaglul Pasha tried his best to come to an understanding to Great Britain on the main principles.

The late Zaglul Pasha during his conference with the Rt. Hon. J. Ramsay MacDonald tried his best to come to an understanding with Great Britain, on the fundamental principles

that Egypt should not only exercise full sovereignty, but also retain control over Sudan. He died without accomplishing the cherished hopes of his life. But the Egyptian nationalists under Nahas Pasha are determined to remove all limitations of sovereignty of their motherland and make her truly independent of foreign control. On the otherhand, as all the political parties of Great Britain, including the British Labour Party under the leadership of J. Ramsay MacDonald,¹ are imperialistic in action, therefore they are virtually united in following the policy of preserving the British Empire—British control over Egypt—at any cost. It may be emphasised that the British Labour Party, with all its pretensions for justice to the oppressed peoples, by its recent actions, has proved to be more imperialistic in its attitude towards Egypt and India than the Tories and the Liberals. British Labour Party's occasional protest against the action of the Tory Govern-

¹ Rt. Hon. Ramsay MacDonald's opposition to Egyptian Independance has been clearly set forth in the British Parliamentary document entitled "Egypt No. 1 (1924)"—Despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner for Egypt and the Sudan, respecting the position of his Majesty's Government in regard to Egypt and the Sudan—Command Paper 2269 published by His Majesty's Stationery Office (London). See Appendix II.

ment in Egypt is nothing more than mere lip-service. Thus the present Tory Government of Great Britain, supported by all political parties, some time ago started with Sarwat Pasha, the ex-Premier, to bring about an alliance with Egypt which would be to the best interests of Great Britain. The chief points of British proposal of an Anglo-Egyptian Alliance are as follows :—

(a) An offensive and defensive alliance between Great Britain and Egypt.

(b) The British Army of Occupation to remain as at present for the defence of Imperial communications. If at the end of ten years no agreement has been reached as to where it is to be stationed the matter to be referred to the League of Nations.

(c) Great Britain to support Egypt in obtaining the consent of the Powers for the reform of the Capitulations to meet present-day conditions.

(d) Great Britain to undertake to secure the admission of Egypt to the League of Nations.

(e) The British representative in Egypt to be an Ambassador with precedence over all other foreign representatives.

(f) Egypt to be free to make commercial treaties, but political treaties to have previous

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

ARAB INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

The people of Arabia have their splendid past, the glory of the Arab Empire. It is natural they should regain their independence and the Arab leaders are making conscious efforts to gain this end. The recent struggles of Arab nationalism in North Africa, and Asia are heroic, but unsuccessful efforts. It is hardly conceivable that they will be able to win their independence without co-operation and aid from out-side sources. They have thrown off Turkish yoke through the aid of Western Powers. But it seems that they have made very little progress, so far as attainment of their independence. In Asia they are under French and British domination, in place of the Turkish rule. Some Arab leaders think that it is a step towards their independence; but is it really so ?

After the Napoleonic War, when Great Britain, with the support of Russia, Austria and Prussia

crushed French ascendancy in the continental Europe and in India, her greatest concern was to consolidate her position in India. She devoted her energy to this ambitious work of empire-building until she established her undisputed supremacy there. About a hundred years after the Napoleonic War, by the World War, British diplomacy with the support of France, Russia, Italy, Japan, the United States of America and many other minor Powers crushed the Sea-Power and the colonial Empire of Germany and at the same time brought about the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. Turkey lost her sovereignty over Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Hedjaz, Asir and Yemen. This was accomplished by a carefully planned Arab revolt aided by British support and through a series of secret treaties between Great Britain, France, Italy and Russia. Under the garb of a mandate from the League of Nations France has established a protectorate over Syria. Great Britain established her supremacy over Palestine and Mesopotamia as British mandates and created so-called independent state of Hedjaz with Emir Hussein as its King, under the British control. Other Arab states in the Arabian peninsula considered to fall also within the British sphere of influence and control.

After eliminating Germany as the political competitor of Britain's world empire, British statesmen calmly began the work of consolidating British Power in the Middle East—the region between the Suez Canal and India—; and in that vast region they are pursuing the same policy as they did in India. During the eighteenth century and early nineteenth century, one of the great concerns of the British rulers of India, was to play one Indian Native State against the other and at the same time sign such treaties of so-called alliance with some of them and to control foreign affairs of these allies, so that they would be deprived of the immense value of independent action in international relations. Curiously enough the same policy is being pursued in the Middle East today.

Just as during the early part of the eighteenth century, and especially after the Battle of Plassey (1757) Britain established her political power on a solid foundation in Bengal and then moved westward, similarly Britain after establishing supremacy in Palestine, a region of supreme strategic importance has taken steps to move eastward. By the Balfour Declaration of 1917, Great Britain agreed to bring into existence with the aid of the Zionists a Jewish state in Palestine. "Of the many influences which brought about that declaration

perhaps the most significant were, first, the desire of British imperialists to secure control of Palestine as a strategic protection of the Suez Canal ; and second, the belief that such a declaration would purchase for the Allies the valuable influence and financial support of Jews throughout the world.”¹

By securing full control over Palestine Britain has established absolute mastery over the Suez Canal, and the Asian mainland bordering the Mediterranean, so that the British naval, land and air forces would be able to co-operate in extending British Power in all directions specially to the south and East. To facilitate the work of establishing British protectorate over the major portion of Arabia, at first the British programme was to conciliate the Arabs by putting the sons of Emir Hussein, the Arab King of Hedjaz (who was under British pay) on various thrones as kings and princes, under British supervision. When the French ousted King Feisal, son of Hussein as the king of Syria, the British made him the king of Iraq (Mesopotamia). The second son of King Hussein was made the king of Kerak

¹ Moon, Parker Thomas: Imperialism and World Politics, —New York—Macmillan Co., 1927. p. 493

(Trans-jordonia) under British protection. For a time British Government cherished the grand idea of making Hussein, the King of Hedjaz as the Arab Caliph, the head of the Islamic world, under British protection. But this plan was upset by the overthrow of King Hussein, by Ibn Saud, the Wahabi King of Nedj, and who is now the ruler of both Nedj and Hedjaz, and who cherishes to extend his power over the rest of Arabia. Although Ibn Saud overthrew Hussein from Hedjaz, the British authorities did not find it to be difficult to come to an understanding with him; because Ibn Saud, during the world war, supported the British against the Turks. Ibn Saud is a very shrewd man and he knows the limitations of his own power and he is not anxious to come in open conflict with the British. At present his quarrel is not with the British but with the two sons of the ex-king Hussein of Hedjaz, who are rulers of Iraq and Trans-jordonia.

On October 10, 1922, Great Britain entered into an alliance with the King Feisal of Iraq and agreed to provide the kingdom with financial and military assistance, on condition that the king agreed "to be guided by the advice of the British High Commissioner on all important matters affecting the international and financial

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

(Trans-jordonia) under British protection. For a time British Government cherished the grand idea of making Hussein, the King of Hedjaz as the Arab Caliph, the head of the Islamic world, under British protection. But this plan was upset by the overthrow of King Hussein, by Ibn Saud, the Wahabi King of Nedj, and who is now the ruler of both Nedj and Hedjaz, and who cherishes to extend his power over the rest of Arabia. Although Ibn Saud overthrew Hussein from Hedjaz, the British authorities did not find it to be difficult to come to an understanding with him ; because Ibn Saud, during the world war, supported the British against the Turks. Ibn Saud is a very shrewd man and he knows the limitations of his own power and he is not anxious to come in open conflict with the British. At present his quarrel is not with the British but with the two sons of the ex-king Hussein of Hedjaz, who are rulers of Iraq and Trans-jordonia.

On October 10, 1922, Great Britain entered into an alliance with the King Feisal of Iraq, and agreed to provide the kingdom with financial and military assistance, on condition that the king agreed "to be guided by the advice of the British High Commissioner on all important matters affecting the international and financial

bligations and interests of His Britannic Majesty." In 1925 when Mosul was awarded to Iraq by the decision of the Council of the League of Nations, Great Britain agreed to continue the alliance with Iraq for 25 years or until Iraq was admitted into the membership of the League of Nations. Great Britain has so far spent not less than £ 200,000,000 for the occupation of Mesopotamia and maintenance of British power there. It is expected that the rich oil-field of Mosul will be of great potential value to Great Britain and her navy. In that case there is little prospect that Iraq will secure her cherished independence.

Great Britain has already used Iraq as an instrument, to detach Mosul from Turkey and many other ways. The existing Anglo-Iraqi Treaty is a direct threat against Persia; and for that reason Persia has never recognized the existence of Iraq as an independent state under British protection (!). In fact the present Anglo-Persian relations are far from cordial because of the British support to Iraq against Persia in the controversy regarding the right of Persian citizens in Iraq. The question of the rights of Anglo-Persian Oil Co., British desire to have the right of civil aviation through Persian territory and the adjustment of Persia's financial

obligations to Britain, are further causes of irritation. Britain realizes that the neutrality between Persia and Soviet Russia may in course of time become a Treaty of Alliance. In that case the Anglo-Iraqi Alliance will be an effective weapon in the hands of British statesmen. Realising this necessity, British Air Forces have established themselves in Iraq and they have already on various occasions, demonstrated their effectiveness. Thus Iraq is being utilised by the British Government against Turkey, Persia and other states which may adopt anti-British policy. Further-more British control over Iraq affords splendid opportunity for Britain to establish complete control over the Persian Gulf.

In the past the British Government used Ibn Saud, the present king of Hedjaz and Nedj against the Turks. But they are now suspicious of the policy of Ibn Saud who may be thinking of taking steps to make himself more powerful and to bring about a united Arab Empire in co-operation with other Moslem Powers. Thus the British authorities had to punish some of the chiefs (underlings) under Ibn Saud, whose activities were anti-Iraqi and thus anti-British. To fight Ibn Saud single-handed may prove costly to the British, thus the British Government has conclu

ARAB INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

a treaty of Alliance with King Abdullah of Trans-jordonia, under such terms as will mean British control over the military, foreign and financial affairs of the state of Trans-jordonia.² During the last few years the British Government has been paying a heavy subsidy to King Abdullah so that he will act in concert with the British in the Middle East.

If Great Britain can control Palestine, Trans-jordonia, and Iraq, then even if Ibn Saud refuse to submit to Great Britain's policy, it will not be very difficult for British to subdue him, in case of necessity. It has been charged by many leaders among the followers of Ibn Saud that the present hostility between the Wahabis and the Iraqis as well as the existing suspicion and enmity between Trans-jordonia and Nedj are being fully utilised by the British in their favour and against the cause of united and independent Arab Empire in the Middle East. There is much truth in this, because it is a historical fact that sometime ago British Foreign Office aided one faction of the Arabs and the India Office supported the other and supplied them with funds and arms, so that

² For the full text of the recent treaty with Great Britain and Trans-jordonia concluded on British Parliamentary Papers Comd. 3069). February 20, 1928. See British Parliamentary Papers (Comd. 3069), quoted in the Appendix IV.

the Arabs would weaken themselves by a civil war.

The British secured supremacy in India by using Indian man-power and at the same time being able to play one Indian Prince against the other. The British authorities are today pursuing the same policy of using the Arab man-power, strategic position and Arab rulers against one another. Whether the British policy in the Middle East succeed or not depend upon various factors, such as international situation and primarily the success of the nationalist movement in India. If the Indian national movement succeeds, through the co-operation of various elements of the Indian people, especially the Hindus and Moslems, to achieve National Independence, then India will be able to aid effectively the cause of Arab Independence. Otherwise Great Britain will be in a position to use India's man-power, strategic position and economic strength against the Arabs, as she did against Turkey during the World War. The present situation in the Middle East, with Arab forces under British control and British Air Forces stationed in Arabia and British Power augmented in the Suez region and the Persian Gulf, is a distinct menace to the cause of Arab and Indian Freedom and Asian Independence.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

PERSIAN INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

When Napoleon planned to attack India with Russian aid, Great Britain had to direct her attention to Persia, that it would not be used as the base of operation against India. When the fear of French aggression disappeared, the problem of Russian march through Central Asia to the Persian Gulf took its place. Later on when Germany was seeking an outlet, in the Persian Gulf, for the Berlin-Bagdad Railway, Great Britain agreed to settle her differences with Russia, purely for strategical reasons—safety of India. Although British economic interests in Persia is very considerable, yet Britain's Persian policy is based primarily on strategical reasons. So long as Britain continues to play the role of a dominant power in the vast region between the Suez Canal and the Persian Gulf, strategical consider-

the Arabs would weaken themselves by a civil war.

The British secured supremacy in India by using Indian man-power and at the same time being able to play one Indian Prince against the other. The British authorities are today pursuing the same policy of using the Arab man-power, strategic position and Arab rulers against one another. Whether the British policy in the Middle East succeed or not depend upon various factors, such as international situation and primarily the success of the nationalist movement in India. If the Indian national movement succeeds, through the co-operation of various elements of the Indian people, especially the Hindus and Moslems, to achieve National Independence, then India will be able to aid effectively the cause of Arab Independence. Otherwise Great Britain will be in a position to use India's man-power, strategic position and economic strength against the Arabs, as she did against Turkey during the World War. The present situation in the Middle East, with Arab forces under British control and British Air Force stationed in Arabia and British Power augmented in the Suez region and the Persian Gulf, is a distinct menace to the cause of Arab and Indian Freedom and Asian Independence.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

PERSIAN INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

When Napoleon planned to attack India with Russian aid, Great Britain had to direct her attention to Persia, that it would not be used as the base of operation against India. When the fear of French aggression disappeared, the problem of Russian march through Central Asia to the Persian Gulf took its place. Later on when Germany was seeking an outlet, in the Persian Gulf, for the Berlin-Bagdad Railway, Great Britain agreed to settle her differences with Russia, purely for strategical reasons—safety of India. Although British economic interests in Persia is very considerable, yet Britain's Persian policy is based primarily on strategical reasons. So long as Britain continues to play the role of a dominant power in the vast region between the Suez Canal and the Persian Gulf, strategical consider-

ation will be the deciding factor in formulating British policy.

It is the opinion of a competent American observer and student of international relations that "almost every action of British Government with respect to Persia, since the beginning of the nineteenth century can be interpreted as the result of aggressive or acquisitive ambitions. Especially this is so in the present century, when the progress of British influence in Persia has very often appeared to strike at the independence of that unfortunate nation. It seemed on several occasions (as in 1919) that Great Britain, . . . having acquired domination over the mineral wealth of the South-west, was about to take the final gulp and swallow the whole country." ¹

During the World War, "as British plans for the extension of control in Mesopotamia travelled to completion, the union of the British and Russian forces from the Caucasus became a major element in the success of their joint operation." ² Thus Persia became a battle-ground for the allied army, violating the neutrality of a sovereign state. In fact, during the World War, Persia was

¹ Seehan : New Persia. New York. The Century Co 1927 page 162.

² Dennis, Alfred L. P. : The Foreign Policies of Soviet Russia: New York., E. P. Dutton & Co. 1924., p. 235

PARSIAN INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

regarded as if the country was a British protectorate. A British authority writes,—“During the war of 1914 onwards the Czarist armies were freely moving in Persian territories. With the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, British troops advanced right up through Persia to the Caspian, and the war ended with Persia effectively in the position of a British *satrapy*.”³

While the British Military occupation of Persia was in progress, the British authorities freely used money to bring the Persian state under control. A British official, fully acquainted with Persia and British activities there writes :—“During the World War and especially after the collapse of Russia in 1917 not only was Persia under British protection, but she was being enabled to a great extent to defray the expenses of Government by British monthly advances. *Apart from personal and local subsidies*, Britain was furnishing her with three hundred and fifty thousand tomans monthly towards meeting the ordinary expenses of government, and a hundred thousand tomans for the up-keep of the Cossack Division —altogether about £ 225,000 monthly.”⁴

³ Arnot, R. Page : Soviet Russia and Her Neighbours. New York. Vanguard Press. 1927. p. 123

⁴ Balfour, Hon. J. M. : Recent Happenings in Persia. London and Edinburgh : William Blackwood and Sons. 1922. page 109

“But when the subsidies and advances were continued after the war, the matter assumed an entirely different and much more serious aspect. It cannot be claimed that the British Empire is generally regarded as a charitable institution and Persians state frankly that the advances occasioned apprehension as to our intentions both amongst the recipients and those who were aware of what was taking place.”⁵

In 1919 when through the efforts of Lord Curzon, the Anglo-Persian Treaty⁶ was concluded, Russia was in no position to oppose British attempt to incorporate Persia into the British Empire. The signing of this treaty was an effort on the part of the British Government to legalise British protectorate over Persia through a solemn agreement. Of course, British authorities always deny any such evil intention; however it will be of some interest to note the following comments on the Anglo-Persian Treaty of 1919 by two American authorities on International Relations :—

⁵ Ibid. pages 111—112.

⁶ For the full text of the “Agreement between His Britannic Majesty’s Government and the Persian Government”, see U. S. Senate Document No. 90, 66th Congress, 1st session or British Parliamentary Papers—Persia No. 1 (1919) Command Papers 300, published by His Britannic Majesty’s Stationery Office (London) and reproduced in Appendix III.

"If in the preamble, the British Government reiterated its pledge, '*to respect absolutely the independence and integrity of Persia*', the formula need not be taken too seriously. What Great Britain intended was a modern, subtle form of imperialist control no less effective, but much less candid, than what it used to be the fashion to designate by the euphemism, '*protectorate*'."

"The Agreement practically placed the Government of the Shah under British direction and established a British protectorate in fact if not in name." *

So sure were the British statesmen—Lord Curzon and Sir Percy Cox—about the importance of the Anglo-Persian Treaty of 1919, *in which British control over Persian Finance, Army, and Foreign Relations, was to be firmly established*, that they paid 75,000 tomans to the three Persian statesmen—Vossug-ed-Dowleh the then Prime Minister, Prince Firuz, the Minister of Finance and Saram-ed-Dowleh—who signed the treaty on behalf of Persia. ⁹ It seems that the British Government spent a large sum

* Moon, Parker Thomas : Imperialism and World Politics. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1927. p. 285

* Dennis, Alfred L. P. : The Foreign Policies of Russia. p. 238

⁹ Seehan : The New Persia.

of money, to bribe members of the Persian Majlis to secure the confirmation of the Anglo-Persian Treaty. Mr. Balfour writes :—"British Government gave a sum of £ 131,000 directly to three ministers (who were in favor of the Anglo-Persian Agreement of August 9, 1919), with, I believe, the express proviso that no inquiry should be made as to its expenditure . . . It has been suggested that it was contemplated that the money should be expended in securing the confirmation of the Agreement by the Majlis . . ." ¹⁰

But the New Persia—the Nationalist Persia—ousted the Ministry ; and the cabinet of Zia-ed-Din, on February 26, 1921 repudiated the Anglo-Persian Treaty of 1919. Persian Nationalists dared to take this bold stand, because the Government of Soviet Russia, under Lenin and Tchicheherin repudiated the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907 (by which Persia was practically partitioned between Great Britain and Russia). To stiffen the opposition of Persian Nationalists against any further British encroachment in Persia, on February 26, 1921, the Soviet Russian Government signed a new treaty supporting Persian national aspirations. By the Russo-Persian Treaty of 1921, the Soviet Government

¹⁰ Balfour, Hon. J. M. Recent : Happenings in Persia. pp. 128-129.

gave up all Russian claims and concessions in Persia, except Russian fishery rights in the Caspian Sea.¹¹

The most important articles of the Russo-Persian Treaty of 1921 are as follows :—

Article II. The Government of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic brands as criminal the policy of the Government of Czarist Russia, which without the agreement of the peoples of Asia and under the guise of assuring the independence of these peoples, concluded with other states of Europe treaties concerning the East which had as their ultimate object its gradual seizure. The Government of the R. S. F. S. R. unconditionally rejects that criminal policy as not only violating the sovereignty of the States of Asia, but also leading to organized brutal violence of European robbers on the living body of the peoples of the East.

Article VIII. The Government of the R. S. F. S. R. declares its complete rejection of that financial policy which the Czarist Government of Russia pursued in the East, supplying the

¹¹ For complete Text of the Treaty see Manchester Guardian of March 31st. 1921. Also see (a) Dennis : Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia. p. 234 (b) Arnot : Soviet Russia and Her Neighbours. pages 162-163 and (c) Millspaugh, A. C. : The American Task in Persia. New York : Century Co. 1925. page 120

Government of Persia with financial means not in order to assist the economic development and flourishing of the Persian people but in the form of a political enfeffement of Persia. The Government of the R. S. F. S. R. therefore resigns all rights to loans furnished to Persia by the Czarist Government, and declares such loans null and not to be repaid. It similarly resigns all demands for the use of those State revenues of Persia by which the said loans were guaranteed.

Article IX. The Government of the R. S. F. S. R. in accordance with its expressed condemnation of the colonial policy of capitalism which served and is serving as a reason for innumerable miseries and sheddings of blood, renounces the use of those financial undertakings of Czarist Russia which had as their object the economical enfeffement of Persia. It therefore hands over to the Persian people the financial sums, valuables and in general, the assets and liabilities of the Discount Credit Bank of Persia, and similarly the movable and immovable property of the said bank existing in the territory of Persia.

Article XI. The Soviet Government confirmed the abolition of the extra-territorial rights which had up to June 26, 1919, been enjoyed by Russian citizens in Persia, placing Russian citizens in Persia henceforth on an equality with

PERSIAN INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

Persian citizens, subject to the same laws and amenable to the same courts of justice.

At this critical moment of Persian history, the Government of the United States gave an indirect support to the cause of Persian Independence. The Government of the United States, although friendly to Great Britain could not approve of the British policy of monopolising the raw materials—especially oil—in Persia and the Middle East. The United States Government was interested in maintaining open door policy in Persia and opposed to any condition which might bar American capital from enjoying equal opportunity in exploiting Persian resources. This attitude of the United States Government was clearly explained in the following instruction of the United States State Department to the American Legation at Teharan on January 21st, 1922.

“You may inform the Persian Government that the Government of the United States is deeply interested in the Open Door and it would insist upon this principle in its exchanges with the British or any other Government. The American Government attaches the greatest importance to the preservation in Persia of such opportunity for American interests as is enjoyed by the interests of any other nation.”

To this Muchir ed Dowleh, the then Persian Prime Minister on January 26, 1922, made the following reply :—

“In thanking you for your communication which you were good enough to make to me, I seize this occasion to assure you that the Imperial Government which as always is attaching great importance to the maintenance of the principle of Open Door, will do everything in its power for the maintenance of this principle, as well as for the development of the relations which exist between our two countries, and in this respect I count very much upon the precious assistance of the American Government.”^{1 2}

Signing of the Russo-Persian Treaty of 1921, the repudiation of the Anglo-Persian Agreement of 1919 by the Persian Government and the opposition of the American Government to the establishment of a virtual protectorate over Persia by any Power, meant a serious defeat for the British Government which was forced to change its tactics on the diplomatic battle-field of Persia. For the time being it preferred to remain inactive politically and militarily, while merely protecting British economic interests—interests of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, Indo-European Telegraph Company and Imperial

^{1 2} Millspaugh : American Task in Persia. pp. 316-317

PERSIAN INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

Bank of Persia which are virtually British Government institutions and other minor concerns.

When it became apparent to the British authorities that Reza Khan represented the strongest factor in Persian politics, they were willing to support him. "In the autumn of 1925, when Reza Khan ascended the throne, it was with the full approval and sympathy of the British. The first Government to recognize Reza as the head of the provisional Government was the British, and the British recognized him first as Shah."¹⁸ It is safe to assert that the British policy towards Persia has been to bring the country within the orbit of British influence or control. This policy has not been abandoned at any time, although diplomatic tactics of Britain in Persia varies to suit various circumstances.

Under the changed condition of New Persia, most of the British statesmen advocate that the British Government should protect its interests in Persia, at any cost, but without taking recourse to bribery, intrigue or aggressive military policy which are bound to create serious suspicion and hostility on the part of the Persian nationalists. The following is a fair statement of British policy in New Persia :—

¹⁸ Seehan : The New Persia. p. 178.

"Persia cannot however, from British point of view, be considered apart from the rest of the Middle East, and in particular from Mesopotamia . . ." ¹⁴ "The future policy in Persia would then seem to be that called for throughout the Near and Middle East namely, firmness where our interests call for it, as in India and Egypt . . . In Persia, British interests, whether political or commercial, are confined to the South, while in the North they are non-existent. . . . A clear indication that we meant to maintain our interests, in Southern Persia, by force if necessary, in the event of the country relapsing into anarchy, but that there our interest ceased, coupled with a refusal to be drawn in future into intrigue and policy of bribes, would in time cause the Persians to realise that Great Britain had no designs upon their cherished independence, and would lead to a return to the condition before the war, when it was said that Englishmen alone could go anywhere in Persia with absolute impunity." ¹⁵

However, whatever may be the future development in New Persia, "it is not likely that Britain's hold over the southern part of the country will be relaxed; and the most definite trend perceptible in the course of the past few

¹⁴ Balfour : Recent Happenings in Persia. page 281

¹⁵ Ibid. pp. 306-307

years has been strengthening of that hold, so that Southern Persia is already, in a practical sense, a part of the British Empire. British policy defends that property ; and its secondary aspect ends to advance to the north." ¹⁵

British Imperial Airways connecting Egypt to India is not a commercial adventure, on the contrary it is primarily a strategical affair. Its operation was delayed because the Persian Government refused to ratify the provisional agreement concluded by the British Government on behalf of the Imperial Airways in October 1925. The Persian Government did not see any reason to approve an agreement which might strengthen British control over the Persian Gulf and the region between the Suez Canal and India, and it might be detrimental to Persian interests and independence. However on April 22, 1926 an important Turkish-Persian Treaty was concluded to protect their mutual interests. The summary of the treaty is as follows :—

"This treaty, called a treaty of friendship and security, binds the two contracting parties not to attack one another, not to participate in a hostile action undertaken by a third power, not to enter a political, economic or financial treaty or convention directed against the other.

¹⁵ Seehan : The New Persia. p. 189.

"The contracting parties further agree to oppose with its military forces any third Power which attempts to make use of its territory in a move against the other, by the passage of troops or military stores, for military surveys, as a base of military operations, as an avenue of retreat, or by inciting the people against the other state.

"The contracting parties agree not to tolerate within its boundaries any organization whose purpose is to disturb the peace or security of the other or to change its constitution, and to expel all persons who indulge in such activity.

"The Contracting parties further agree to take all necessary measures, either separately or together, to prevent unstable border-peoples living in their territories from making incursions into the territory of the other.

"Within six months after the ratification of this treaty the two states will send plenipotentiaries to Teharan to conclude agreements on commerce, consular representation, customs, postal and telegraph service and extradition. They will further agree upon methods of settling disputes arising between them which cannot be settled by diplomatic means.

"This treaty was written in Turkish, Persian, and French, but in case of differences of opinion the French text is to be considered authentic

Its duration is set at five years but it will continue automatically from year to year unless denounced, upon six months notice, by one of the Powers."¹⁷

On April 26, 1927, the Shah of Persia announced his intention to approach foreign Governments in order to secure their consent to abolition of capitulations. The British Government did not favor the proposal. On the contrary the British Government concluded the Anglo-Hedjaz Treaty in May 1927, by which the signatories pledged themselves to maintain friendly relations with Bahrein. This was regarded as prejudicial to Persian interests. Bahrein, with a population of 120,000, consists of a group of islands in the Persian Gulf, 300 miles south of Basra. Although Great Britain in 1868 established a sort of protectorate over it, by guaranteeing its autonomy Persia never recognized this agreement and always claimed Persian sovereignty over it; and the justice of Persian claim was recognized by Lord Clarendon in 1869. In November 1927, the Persian Government protested against the Anglo-Hedjaz Treaty; and not being satisfied with the British reply, during the last days of December 1927 complained to the League of Nations "that the treaty concluded

¹⁷ The Nation (New York) August 25, 1926

between Great Britain and Hedjaz last May encroached upon the sovereignty of Persia". The outcome of this dispute, in all probability, will result in British victory and thus further increase of British power and prestige in Southern Persia, and greater tension between Britain and nationalist Persia supported by Soviet Russia, Turkey and Afghanistan.

During the recent visit of His Majesty King Amanullah of Afghanistan in England, Great Britain tried to secure an Anglo-Afghan Agreement which would be to the interest of Great Britain; but apparently British efforts failed. However on April 12, 1928, the Soviet Russian Government scored a diplomatic victory over Great Britain when the Afghan Government signed an agreement for Afghan-Russian Air Service in regard to the Kabul-Tashkent Air Service. This Soviet-Afghan Agreement forced the British Government to seek an Anglo-Persian Treaty favoring the abolition of the capitulations and tariff autonomy for Persia. On May 7, 1928, (less than a month after the signing of the Afghan-Soviet Agreement mentioned above) by an order in Council, Great Britain suspended British jurisdiction in Persia. And a few days later (on May 10) the new Anglo-Persian Treaty was concluded by which Persia

asserted her tariff autonomy and agreed to that under certain conditions she will allow British areoplanes pass through Persian territory and will establish areodromes which the British will be allowed to use. The following extracts from the editorial article of the London Times entitled "Anglo-Persian Agreements" published on May 14, 1928 give an interesting side-light on the present Anglo-Persian situation :—

"The convention signed...(on May 10, 1928) do not, of course, settle all the questions outstanding between Great Britain and Persia. The Persian Government has not yet recognized the Kingdom of Iraq ; to a British claim on account of the large sum spent on the South Persian Rifles it opposes a counter-claim for damages during the British military occupation of Persian territory, which undoubtedly suffered from the operations of British, Russian and Turkish troops during the War. But the ground has been cleared for further negotiations, and it is agreeably significant that the distrust which prevented the fulfilment of the Air Agreement of 1925 has diminished sufficiently for the Shah's Government to agree to reopen further negotiations with Imperial Airways in the near future. The recognition of Iraq is more likely to follow the signature of the conventions now

that the Shah has appointed Nasir Ul-Mulk, an official of very high standing as Acting Consul General at Bagdad. The improvement in administrative efficiency and in the discipline of the Army, on which the Shah Reza has concentrated his great energy, has made Persia a wealthier and safer country by far than it was a few years ago. The financial situation of the country is improving, roads are opening districts that were formerly stagnant or disaffected to the trader and to the gendarme; important railway routes are being surveyed. In this country (England) there has been an understanding of the importance of the change. Errors of judgment and at times a certain lack of tact on our part (British) undoubtedly affronted Persian nationalism in the years that immediately followed the War. More recently the improvement in Anglo-Persian relations has been continuous"

The policy of Soviet Russia towards the peoples of the East is not purely altruistic, although the desire of the Soviet leaders especially M. Tchicheherin, to free the peoples of the East, may be sincere. In this desire there is the element of self-interest; so that the peoples of Asia would not make a common cause or be utilised by Great Britain against Soviet Russia.

It has been well said by a Soviet Russian diplomat in Persia that "Government may change, but Russia always remains." This Russia, under the Soviet Government, has given up the aggressive policy in Persia but is following the policy of peaceful penetration. This Russia of today is as energetically opposed to any British economic advance in northern Persia, as was the old Russia of the days of the Tsars. It is by no means an exaggeration to say that such an advance would contain definite danger of war."¹⁸

It was the Russian support to nationalist Persia that defeated the British scheme of controlling Persia through the Anglo-Persian Agreement of 1919. It was the Soviet-Turkish joint action against Britain and Greece contributed largely to the success of Nationalist Turkey. Soviet support to the cause of Afghan independence strengthened Afghan cause and later on Britain had to acknowledge Afghan sovereignty. However, consolidation of Soviet Russian position through neutrality treaties with Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan, has forced Great Britain to counteract it by adopting means to strengthen her position in Palestine, Arabia, Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf.

¹⁸ Times (London) June 18, 1928.

New Persia, anxious to maintain her national independence, and to strengthen her position diplomatically, has signed in 1926, security pacts with Soviet Russia, Turkey and Afghanistan. And on June 15, 1928, during the visit of the King and Queen of Afghanistan at Teheran, "proptocols to the security pacts of 1926 were signed, between Persia and Afghani-
stan and Persia and Turkey, whereby in the event of war between any one of the signatories and a third power, the other party acts as a conciliator. The Afghan Legation at Teheran and the Persian Legation in Kabul were raised to embassies." ¹⁹

It is apparent that, as a matter of self-defence while Persia is maintaining friendly relations with Great Britain, she is cultivating closer intimacy with Soviet Russia, Turkey and Afganistan. "In Persia you have the two imperialist fronts (British and Soviet Russian Imperialisms) practically touching. Persia and Afghanistan profit by the fact that they are between two rival imperialist systems and they play off one against the other. They can never be brought properly into Russian system because their state of society does not allow of using the Socialist cement to fix them in it.....

¹⁹ Times (London) June 18, 1928.

PERSIAN INDEPENDENCE AND INDIA

The Russian front may work round and break up our own (British) imperialist systems..... Whichever succeeds in making the strongest appeal to the moral instincts in these new nations is going to win.”²⁰

There are possibilities that Great Britain will be involved in conflict in the Middle East and Persia be forced to array against her. In such circumstances British naval, air and land forces will press upon Persia through the Persian Gulf, Iraq, Trans-Jordonia, Palestine and Beluchistan. However, India's man power, strategic position, raw materials will be the determining factors in the contest. It may be safely asserted that India holds the key to the future of Persian Independence. Indian and Persian nationalists should come to some form of friendly understanding so that they may co-operate in maintaining their vital interests such as national independence.

²⁰ Report of the summary of a lecture on "Nationalism in the Near East" delivered by Mr. George Young at Caxton Hall, London, March 21st 1928, Printed in Foreign Affairs (London) May 1928. p. 351.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA AND THE MOVEMENT FOR INDIAN INDEPENDENCE.

It is often asserted by many British scholars as well as those of other lands who wish to please the British authorities for some special interests of their own, that Great Britain secured control over India accidentally and the sole purpose of British Government's insistence to rule India is to serve the people and the cause of civilization and humanity. It is needless to say that no honest Indian—moderate, constitutionalist, nationalist or revolutionist—believes in Britain's mission of philanthropy in India. The following candid statement of a member of the present British Cabinet throws considerable light on the motive underlying British solicitude for India :—

“We did not conquer India for the benefit of the Indians. I know it is said at missionary meetings that we conquered India to raise the

level of the Indians. *That is a cant.* We conquered India as the outlet for the goods of Great Britain. We conquered India by the sword, and by the sword we should hold it. (Shame) Call shame if you like. I am stating facts. I am interested in missionary work in India and have done much work of that kind, but I am not such a hypocrite as to say we hold India for Indians. We hold it as the finest outlet for British goods in general, and for Lancashire cotton goods in particular.”¹

British domination of India is the best example of modern imperialism. In 1600 when the East India Company, with the royal support, started its adventure in the Orient, particularly in India, it was purely a commercial enterprise and profits was its motive. At that time it was not trying to establish political supremacy of the British in India or any other part of the Orient. With the growth of the East India Company in India, British influence spread in various parts of the Orient. It was Duplex, the Governor of the French trading posts and possessions in India, who originated the bold and systematic

¹ An extract from the speech of Sir W. Joynson-Hicks, the Home Secretary of the present British Government (Baldwin Government), quoted in the Indian Social Reformer of November 28th, 1925.

plan of employing Indian Man Power and Money to build up a vast colonial empire for France. He intrigued to further the civil wars then raging among the Indian Princes in order to take advantage of the situation.²

The British and French fought in India as a part of the Anglo-French wars of the eighteenth century in Europe, America and the Orient for world supremacy. The French were defeated about 1757.³ Since 1757 the British have become progressively masters of India and through India of practically the entire region from Egypt to China.

As a matter of fact, the economic conquest of India by the East India Company preceded the political conquest. The characteristic feature of the political conquest was that the East India Company did not undertake it until it had secured an economic grip upon the country. As alien as Alexander's army, it did not impose political authority until it acquired political authority. It insinuated itself into Indian life before it seized

² Col. Malleon : Duplex and the Struggle for India by European Nations. Oxford University Press.

³ (a) Seely, Sir. J. R. : Expansion of England. Boston. Little Brown Co. 1922 (b) Basu, Maj. B.D. : Rise of the Christian Power in India. Vols. 1-5. Calcutta, R. Chatterjee. 1924. (c) Roberts, P. E. : History of British India. Oxford University Press. 1923.

the Indian Government. Its first concern was nothing more than to secure free trade, a peaceable residence, and the high esteem of the Indian rulers. From that everything else followed.⁴ The officials of the East India Company did not hesitate to adopt all kinds of questionable methods—forgery, bribing, treachery, plundering, intrigue, and fomenting civil wars among Indian Princes etc.—to gain their end of acquiring political power.⁵

When the East India Company assumed the ruling power, it developed its own tariff system. Protection in favour of Great Britain and tariff against India was the underlying principle. By this policy "a great impulse was communicated to British commerce and industry and the objects of British national policy was accomplished but their effects on Indian trade were disastrous."⁶ The fiscal policy towards India during the rule of the East India Company is characterised in the following account:—

⁴ Mac Donald, J. Ramsay : The Government of India. New York, B. W. Heubsch & Co. 1920. p. 30.

⁵ (a) Burke, Edmond : Impeachment of Warren Hastings.

(b) Moitra, A. K. : Clive, the Forger. (a Bengalee work)
Calcutta.

(c) Basu : Rise of the Christian Power in India.

⁶ Banerjea, Prof. Pramathanath : Fiscal Policy in India.
Macmillan & Co. London. p. 15.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

"In 1787, cotton manufactures from India were subject to a duty of 50 percent, except dimity and calicoes which paid $16\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Additions to the rates were subsequently made and in 1799 some classes of cotton goods paid duty at the rate of 122 per cent. In 1819 the duty on many descriptions of Indian goods was as high as $271\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But injustice did not end with high duties. The importation into Great Britain of many classes of goods from India, such as embroidered shawls, handkerchiefs, coloured muslins, velvets, silk, crepe, chintz and calico towels with colored borders was absolutely prohibited." ⁷

On the other hand, British manufacturers employed the arm of political injustice "to keep down and strangle a competitor with whom they could not have contended on equal terms." The late eminent British historian, H. H. Wilson wrote :—"Had India been independent she would have imposed preventive duties upon British goods and thus would have preserved her own productive industry from annihilation. The act of self-defense was not permitted her ; she was at the mercy of the stranger." ⁸

⁷ Ibid. pages 19-20. Also vide "Accounts and papers Relative to East India Trade." (House of Commons. 1813).

⁸ Wilson's History of India. Vol I. p 385.

After the so-called Sepoy mutiny of 1857, which was really a national uprising for Indian independence⁹ and which was put down with the most ruthless massacre of innocent population of India, by the British Army, the rule of the East India Company was abolished and the Government of India was transferred to the British crown. A British student of the history of the Sepoy Mutiny, Mr Edward Thompson, has, in his recent work given some account of British barbarism. The following passages will give some idea of British atrocity in India. The late Lord Roberts was a subaltern and took an active part in the suppression of the Mutiny wrote his diary "When a prisoner in, I am the first one to call out to have him hanged." Mr Thompson quotes :—

"The executions of Natives were indiscriminate to the last degree...In two days forty-two men were hanged on the roadside and a batch of twelve men were executed because their faces were turned the wrong way, when they were marching on the march. All the villages in his front were burnt when he halted. *These severities would not have been justified by the Cawnpore massacre because that took place before the diabolical act...*"

⁹ The Indian War of Independence of 1857, by an Indian Nationalist.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

“Martial Law had been proclaimed ; these terrible Acts passed by the Legislative Council in May and June were in full operation and *soldiers and civilians alike were holding Bloody Assize, or slaying Natives without any assize at all, regardless of sex or age. Afterwards, the thirst for blood grew stronger still.* It is on the record of our British Parliament, in papers sent home by Governor-General of India in Council, that the aged, women and children, are sacrificed as well as those guilty of rebellion. They were not deliberately hanged, but burnt to death in their villages—perhaps now and then accidentally shot. Englishmen did not hesitate to boast or to record their boastings in writings in writing, that they had ‘spared no one’ and that ‘peppering away at niggers’ was very pleasant past-time, ‘enjoyed amazingly.’”¹⁰

The following passage from the report of the “Governor General in Council”, 24th December, 1857, on the state of affairs in the previous July throws considerable light on the treatment of the people throughout the North Western Provinces and the Punjab :—

“The indiscriminate hanging, not only of persons of all shades of guilt, but of those whose

¹⁰ (a) Thompson, Edward : *The Other Side of the Medal*. New York. Harcourt Brace & Co. (b) Kaye's *History of the Sepoy War*.

It was at the least very doubtful, and the general burning and plunder of villages, whereby innocent as well as the guilty, without regard to age or sex, were indiscriminately punished, and in some cases, sacrificed, had deeply exasperated large communities not otherwise hostile to the Government; that the cessation of agriculture, and the consequent famine were impending; that there were sepoy soldiers passing through the country, some on leave, others who had gone to their homes after the breaking up of regiments, having taken no part in the mutiny, but having done their utmost to prevent it; others who had risked their lives in saving their European officers from the sanguinary fury of their comrades; and that all of these men, in the temper that at that time generally prevailed among the English officers and residents throughout the country, and still unhappily prevails in some quarters, were liable to common penalty; and lastly, that the proceedings of the officers of the Government had given color to the rumor that the Government meditated a general bloody persecution of Mohammedans and Hindus."

The history of India from the Battle of Plassey (1757) to the so-called Sepoy Mutiny of 1857—58 shows that the East India Company

followed the policy of ruthless conquest by wars, in which Indian soldiers were used to fight against the Indians, for the promotion of British interests. The outbreak of the Sepoy Mutiny convinced British statesmen that, if they were to continue British supremacy in India, it would be imperative that they should adopt a new policy. (1) The abolition of the East India Company and introduction of direct control of India by the British Government, (2) preservation of the "Native States of India", (3) encouragement to the work of christenising India, (4) reorganization of the Indian Army, (5) denial of self-government and political authority to the people of India, (6) striking terror by various means, including enforcement of "Lawless Laws", (7) utilisation of Indian resources to strengthen British economic and industrial power and at an economic loss of India and (8) application of the general policy of "divide and rule" were the principal methods adopted by British statesmen to consolidate British Power in India. These points have been elaborated with documentary evidence in the work "Consolidation of the Christian Power in India."¹¹

¹¹ Basu, Major. B. D.: Consolidation of the Christian Power in India, published by R. Chatterjee, 91, Upper Circular Road, Calcutta. India.

In 1877 Queen Victoria assumed the title of Empress of India." During the same year Sir James Strachey as the Finance Minister of the Government of India gave a very clear exposition of British Colonial fiscal policy. He said :—

"We are often told that it is the duty of the Government of India to think of Indian interests alone, and that if interests of Manchester suffer, this is no affair of ours. For my part, I utterly repudiate such doctrine. I have not ceased to be an Englishman because I have passed the greater part of my life in India and have become a member of the Indian Government. The interests of Manchester at which some people sneer are the interests not only of the great intelligent population engaged directly in the cotton trade, but of millions of Englishmen. I am not ashamed to say that while I hope I feel as strongly as any man, my duties which I owe India, there is no higher duty in my mind than that which I owe to my own country (Great Britain).¹²

Subordination of the interests of the people of India to those of the British people remains to-day as a cardinal policy of British Imperialism.

¹² Speech in the Governor General's Legislative Council
Financial Statement 1877.

lism.¹³ Thus inspite of all professions of reforms, the people of India are denied full control over the finances of the country. Nature has been kind to endow India with raw materials, possibly the richest in the world. An English missionary who has considerable experience in India writes:—"India's immense exports of grain are sufficient indication that at any rate she raises enough agricultural produce to satisfy the demands of her total population. She amply supplied with coal and iron, more than sufficient for her own needs. Probably no country in the world possesses such enormous reserves of water-power. She has virtual monopoly of world's jute, and could herself meet more than the world's entire demand for tea and rubber. She is rich in copra and oil seeds, she conducts a very large export trade in hides, and she contains one of the world's largest oil-fields. There are very few of India's needs that could not be met from her own resources, were her industries properly developed." The same English authority rightly asserts that "till now

¹³ (a) Sarkar, Prof. Jadunath : Economic History of India Calcutta.

(b) Rai, Lajpat : England's Debt to India. New York B. W. Huebsch Co.

(c) Shah, Prof. K. T. : Sixty years of Indian Finance London. P. S. King & sons. 1921.

India's economic expansion has been severely limited by the consideration for British interests. Agriculture and industry have been so developed as to secure that India shall supply Britain with the maximum of food and raw material, and receive in turn the maximum of British manufactured products." ¹⁴ Prof. A. Demangeon of the Sorbonne University summarises the economic significance of British Imperialism as follows :—

"India is the typical colony for exploitation. Immensely rich and thickly populated, she represents for her masters at once fortune and defense. It is through India that the British Empire assures her destiny. India is the halting place of British commerce to the Far East. India gives the fleet places of support for the sea routes. India recruits for the Army legions of high-spirited soldiers ; native contingents fight for Great Britain in China and South Africa. During the Great War, India supplied more than a million men, of whom more than 100,000 were killed. India is for Great Britain an enormous market ; two-thirds of her importations come from English sources ; she furnishes 51 per cent of the wheat production of the Empire ; 58 per cent of the tea, 73 per

¹⁴ Holland, W. E. S. : The Indian Outlook. London, 1926.

cent of the coffee, and almost all the cotton. An immense British capital has been invested in Indian mines, factories, plantations, railways, and irrigation works. India pays interest on probably 350 million pounds sterling. India keeps busy an army of British officials whose salaries she pays and whose savings every year go to Great Britain. She pours into British coffers the interests of her public debt, the pensions of old officials, the governmental expenses of her administration. More than 30 million pounds sterling a year is the estimate of the sums that India pays in the United Kingdom to her creditors, her stockholders and officials. At that we do not know how much she brings to the merchants who trade with her and the shippers who transport her goods. Never was the term exploitation better applied.”¹⁵ The same authority asserts that British control of India enabled Great Britain to assert industrial supremacy. He writes:—

“The flood of wealth that has flowed into Great Britain since she has been exploiting the tropical world has proceeded to a large extent from India, and it was there in particular

¹⁵ Demangeon, A.: *America and the Race for World Domination*. New York. Doubleday, Page & Co. 1921, pp. 209—210.

that the fortune of the merchants of London was made.....To her (India) the East India Company owed that unheard of prosperity of which Macaulay said that history knows nothing equal to it.....By tributes imposed upon the Indian princes, by taxes levied on the people, by personal profits of the Company's agents, and by export of gold, precious stones, and the fine textiles, there were built up enormous Indian fortunes' which came to England at the very time when the country was heading for the Industrial Revolution and had most need of capital. With this wealth the coal mines, the blast furnaces, the iron works, and the cotton and woolen mills of Great Britain were enabled to set up their new machinery and assume industrial supremacy in the markets of the world." 16

The opinion of this French savant regarding exploitation of India has been confirmed by no less an authority than a British Prime Minister, who wrote :—"When all is said and done and the balance is struck, I think there can be no doubt that India suffers greatly because so much of the created wealth is spent and fructifies outside itself.....*The sum paid out*

16 Demangeon, A : The British Empire. New York, 1925. pp. 238—239.

*of India in this way are increasing. The grand total of charges upon Indian Revenues paid in England was £20,000,000 per annum at the outbreak of the war; in 1835 they were £3,000,000, in 1850 they were £3,500,000.....The drain from private business is unknown, but the whole transaction lumped with all other balances in exchange is seen in the figures of Indian export and import, which show in money values an adverse balance from £20,000,000 to £30,000,000."*¹⁷

Direct results of British exploitation of India include the destruction of Indian industries. The masses of India have thereby become victims of abject poverty and recurring famines.¹⁸ About 85 per cent of the Indian people depends upon agriculture for their livelihood, and they are the worst victims of imperialism. Sir Charles Elliot, the late member of the Viceroy's Council and Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal said: "I do not hesitate to say that half of our agricultural population never know from year's end to year's end what it is to have their hunger satisfied."¹⁹ It is a fact that the peasants of Central Asia

¹⁷ MacDonald : Government of India. pp. 149—151.

¹⁸ Digby, Sir William : Prosperous British India. 1900.

Dutt, R. C. : Economic History of India in Victorian Era.

¹⁹ Russell, Charles Edward : Uplifting of the many.

Under the Tsar's regime were less exposed to exploitation through heavy taxation than are the Indian peasants. According to various authorities, Russia's demands upon land-owners in Central Asian possessions are not so exacting as ours in India, for the British Government insists on a fifth of the produce, making no allowance for good or bad years, while Russia is said to take only a tenth, and to allow for variations of production.²⁰ In some cases the British Government takes away more than sixty per cent of the net product of an Indian farmer in the shape of land revenue alone.²¹

Lord Sydenham and other British imperialists cunningly suggest that the Indian people under the British rule pay the lowest rate of taxation.²² But they forget the fact that the *per capita* income of the people of India is possibly the lowest in the world. Sir Visweswarya in an address before the Indian Economic Conference has observed that the annual average per capita income in the

²⁰ Colquhoun, Sir Archibald R.: *Russia Against India*. New York. Harpers. 1901, page 136.

²¹ Hardie, Keir: *India*. O' Donnell: *Failure of Lord Curzon*.

²² Lord Sydenham in the *Current*, *History Magazine of New York Times*, October, 1924.

United Kingdom is \$240, whereas in India it is less than \$18 ; the death rate per thousand is below 14 in Great Britain and over 30 in India ; the average expectation of life is 45 in England and 24 years in India.²³ As the recent Labour Premier of Britain points out, the people of India, because of their poverty, have not the capacity to pay the normal rate of taxation. "The official apologists keep reminding us of the low taxation of India", he states, "but it has nothing to do with the matter. *The question is what is the taxable capacity of the people*, and as regards the great mass the answer must be, "practically nil". Englishmen can be taxed, on the average, £10 a head, and Indians only a shilling, and the Indian impost will be heavier than the English."²⁴

Since the days of the East India Co., Great Britain has had enriched by India's wealth by billions of pounds sterling, while the Indian masses are reduced to most pitiable condition by this continuous process of exploitation. The following remark of an American, expert on Far Eastern situation, portrays the condition as it exists in India today : "You see at least

²³ The Modern Review (Calcutta), December, 1924. P. 730 and also Vide. MacDonald's Government of India. p. 139.

²⁴ MacDonald, J. Ramsay : Government of India. p. 149.

90 per cent of the 317,000,000 people of India in abysmal depths of benightedness out of which no sincere attempt ever seems to have been made to lift them. You see perhaps 70 per cent of them wallowing in abject poverty and such conditions of life as probably exist nowhere else on earth."²⁵

Considering the awful poverty of the masses, British militarism in India is a serious drain on the economic resources of the people. The expected revenue of India for the year 1923-24 was estimated by Sir Basil Blackett to be about \$661,800,000. The amount estimated for the military expenditure for the same period was \$207,000,000.²⁶ This amount is larger than the military and naval expenditures of Japan for the same period. The strength of the army in India before the World War was 77,500 regular British troops and 159,000 native soldiers. Even after the World War it has not been materially reduced.

The primary function of the British army is to keep India under subjection, and to preserve and extend the British Empire. Defense of India from foreign aggression is also one of its functions. But Great Britain has syste-

²⁵ Millard, Thomas F. : Conflict of Policies in Asia. New York. Century Company. P. 132.

²⁶ Material and Moral Progress of India, 1922-23, pp.144-145.

metically disarmed the people of India and studiously refused to allow the Indians the education and opportunity to become commissioned officers. Under the present scheme of Indian Army organization Indians are barred from serving in the artillery, and Indian officers—they are few in number—are deprived of all real power and opportunity for achieving distinction and proper military training of high character. Although there is some talk of “Indianisation of the Indian Army”, the policy of discrimination against Indians is being carried out with great determination. The British Government in India apparently does not want to carry out the recommendations of the Skeen Commission²⁷ which has made modest suggestions of establishing a National Military College and selection of larger number of Indian students without any discrimination of caste, creed or colour, but through competitive examinations, for their training in England to become officers in the Indian Army. Indians are not eligible to join Indian Air Forces in the capacity of pilots or officers. Although India is the training ground for British Generals and Field

²⁷ Skeen Commission Report; published by His Majesty's Stationary Office. London. (b) The Times (London), August 23, 1927. p. 9.

Marshals and Australian and Canadian officers are being trained for Imperial purposes, yet the Indian people are not trusted with that type of military education which will make them fully able to take charge of Indian National Defence. And today the so-called Indian Parliament or the Indian Legislative Assembly has no effective voice on the question of Indian National Defense. After depriving the Indian people of the responsibility of national defense, the British Government alleges that it is saving India from foreign invasion. By bearing the expenses of training and maintaining some 80,000 British soldiers and officers who are stationed primarily for the preservation of British imperial interests, India is made to pay the military cost of her own exploitation. Britain does not pay a penny of Indian military expenditure, although it has been repeatedly pointed out by British as well as Indian statesmen that "Britain must share the cost of defending India, for on the security of her dominions (India) depends the stability of the British world-empire."²⁸

From a purely economic point of view, British military policy in India is an unjust imposition on the poor people of India to further the ends of British imperialism. The Rt. Hon.

²⁸ Colquhoun : Russia Against India. P. 149.

J. Ramsay MacDonald says : "A large part of the army in India—certainly one-half—is the Imperial army which we require for other than purely Indian purposes, and its cost, therefore should be met from Imperial and not Indian funds. When we stationed troops in other parts of the Empire, we did not charge them upon the colonies, but in India we have the influence of the dead hand.....*The present plan, by which Indian pays for the Imperial Army stationed there without in any way determining policy, is as bad as it can be. If the existing system of military defence is to last, the whole cost of the British army stationed in India should be borne by the Imperial exchaquer.*"²⁹ Over and over again the people of India had to bear the expense of British imperialistic aggressive wars in China, Afghanistan, Africa and other parts of the world. The Indian nationalists oppose the idea of India's man-power, economic resources and strategic position being used to subjugate other nations. They demand that India must control the military affairs of the nation and thus be able to reduce military expenditure and take a definite stand against militarism and imperialism.

²⁹ MacDonald, J. Ramsay : Government of India, pp. 153—155.

It is the contention of many students of British Imperialism in India that under its influence India has been demoralised. Mahatma Gandhi during his trial made a written statement in which he said : "Little do they realise that the Government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no juggling in figures can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye.....I hold it to be a virtue to be disaffected towards a Government which in its totality has done more harm to India than any previous system. India is less manly under British rule than she ever was before. Holding such a belief, I consider it to be a sin to have affection for the system." ³⁰

One of the things that remains as an eternal disgrace to the British rule in India is its opium policy. The British East India Co. not only forced opium upon China and fought the Opium Wars, but it also made the people of India victims of the opium evil—merely for profit. The opium policy of the East India Co. has been summed up in the following lines : "It sacrificed (Indian) national interests in order to make

³⁰ Gandhi, M. K. : Young India. New York. Heubsch & Co. 1923, pp. 1052—54.

profits. It ordered the ploughing up of fields of poppies when its stock of opium was sufficient and did not want to depress prices ; at another time, *and for the same business reason, it decreed planting of poppy crops instead of grain.*' ' ³¹

The present day opium policy of the British Indian Government is the same as it was during the days of Warren Hastings, with a very slight modification. It has been summed up in the report of the Indian Retrenchment Commission of 1923 by Lord Inchcape, who recommended that since opium is an important source of revenue, Indian cultivators should be encouraged by the Government to continue growing the poppy. ³² The opium trade in India is the British Indian Government's monopoly. The people of India in general and all Indian nationalists in particular, are opposed to the British Indian Government's opium policy, and want the cultivation of the poppy and the manufacture of opium strictly limited to scientific and medicinal purposes. ³³

The British Indian Government derives annually more than \$20,000,000 from opium

³¹ MacDonald : Government of India. Page. 125.

³² La Motte, Ellen N. : The Ethics of Opium, New York Century Co. 1924.

³³ "Opium in India" by National Christian Council of India, Burma and Ceylon. Calcutta, 1924.

revenue. Profit or revenue being the first consideration, the British Government refuses to restrict the production of opium. In the recent International Opium Conference held at Geneva, Mr. Campbell, the British Indian representative, repeatedly opposed the American plan of restriction of production of opium for medicinal and scientific purposes only.³⁴ The sinister attitude of the British Indian Government on the opium question can be fully realised when we see that although 5000 British medical men and women have declared opium to be poison, the British Indian Government regards opium as a "household remedy" for all kinds of sickness of the masses of India. The Government allows practically unrestricted sale of opium from licensed stalls on the ground that India has not enough hospitals and medical men and the masses should use opium as medicine. The people of India has no control over the finances of the country, so they cannot abolish the curse of opium (as Japan has done for her people) although they are anxious to do so. Indian leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Dr. Rabindranath Tagore and others are seeking

³⁴ Gavit, John Palmer: "Opium". New York.
Brentano. 1927.

world co-operation to suppress the opium evil.³⁵

One of the justifications of British rule in India, offered by many, is that Great Britain is civilising the people of India, and affording splendid facilities for education. Perhaps it is well to record the opinion of Sir Thomas Munro, Governor of Madras during the early nineteenth century under the East India Company, about the existing condition of the people of India. He wrote: "If a good system of agriculture unrivalled manufacturing skill, a capacity to produce whatever can contribute to their convenience of luxury, *schools established in every village for teaching reading, writing and arithmetic*, the general practice of hospitality and charity among each other, and above all a treatment of the female sex full of confidence, respect and delicacy, are among the signs which denote a civilized people—then the Hindus are not inferior to the nations of Europe; and if civilization is to become an article of trade between England and India, I am convinced

³⁵ Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U. S. House of Representatives on "Limitation of Habit Forming Drugs and Raw Materials from which they A Made". Washington, D. C. 1923.

that England will gain by the import of cargo." ³⁶

In the period just preceding the British occupation of India and during the earlier decades of the East India Company's rule, India was not an illiterate country. The highest type of "*modern scientific education*" was not, of course available. But so far as literary knowledge of three R's go, India was then more advanced than now. On the strength of British official documents and a missionary report concerning education in Bengal prior to the British occupation, Prof. Max Muller has left it on record that there were then 80,000 native schools in Bengal, or one for every 400 of the population. According to the India Year Book for 1924, edited by Sir Stanley Reed there were in 1921-1922 in Bengal 33 arts colleges, 887 high schools and 35,621 primary schools, total 36,541. So that the number of educational institutions has become less than half of what it was in Bengal prior to British occupation. At present there is one educational institution in Bengal for every 1,278 of population, as against one of every 400 prior to British occupation... Since Bengal possesses more educational institutions than any other large province and its

³⁶ The Modern Review. Calcutta, December 1924. page, 728.

literacy is also higher, we need not dwell on the progress made elsewhere.³⁷

It is enough to say that 2·5 per cent of the population of British India is enrolled in primary schools and less than 3 per cent is undergoing elementary education of any kind. Rev. Fred B. Fisher, Methodist Bishop of Calcutta, in comparing the educational condition of India and that of the Philippines says :—"In the sixteen years of our Commission Government in the Philippines, from 1900 to the passage of the Jones Bill in 1916, 50 per cent of the children in the Philippines had been put in school. In India today after an administration over a century, only 20 per cent of Indian children are in school. There is but one school for every seven towns and villages."³⁸

It will be of interest to note that the British Indian Government annually spends less for education in all India than Columbia University spends for its works.³⁹ The general educational condition of the people of some of the states ruled by Indian Princes, especially the states of Mysore, Trivancore and Baroda is far superior to that of

³⁷ The Modern Review. Calcutta, 1924. pages 727-728.

³⁸ Fisher, Fred B. : India's Silent Revolution. Macmillan Co. 1920. p. 156.

³⁹ The Modern Review. Calcutta. Sept. 1924, p. 349.

the people of the British Indian provinces. ⁴⁰ The greatest defect of the educational system of British India is not only the neglect of education of the masses, but absolute inadequacy of scientific, medical, technical and agricultural education to meet the needs of the nation, in spite of the fact that the examination of the proportion of college-going population to the total population of a single tract like Bengal indicates that with a population approximately that of the United Kingdom, proportion of educated classes who are taking full-time University courses is ten times as great as in England. ⁴¹ But it must not be forgotten that according to the last census report the literate population of India was 59 per thousand or less than 6 per cent., and the standard of education in Indian schools is far inferior to that of Germany, Great Britain, France, Japan or the United States. ⁴²

In spite of very limited educational facilities and lack of encouragement of education by the Government of India, India can be justly proud of men like Dr. Rabindranath Tagore, Dr. Jaga-

⁴⁰ Recent Educational Progress in India by Saint Nihal Singh in the Contemporary Review, London, January, 1918.

⁴¹ Statement on Moral & Material Condition of India, 1920. (British Govt. Publication) P. 163.

⁴² India Year Book 1922. P. 449.

dish Chandra Bose, Dr. P. C. Ray, Dr. Raman, Dr. Shah and many others in the field of educational achievements. The people of India in the past contributed a great deal to the progress and culture of the world. By the present policy of fostering ignorance and neglecting education among the people of India, the British Government has done great harm not only to the people of India, but to the world at large.

It is generally asserted that the British Government in India is training the people in the art of self-government. But long before the British possessed anything like democratic representative self-government, the people of India enjoyed the blessings of their own self-governing political institutions.⁴³ Since the days of the East India Company, it has been the cardinal policy of the British Government to exclude the people of India from assuming the responsibility of governing themselves, so that in time they would be rendered incapable of self-government by the lack of experience. Writing to Lord Canning in 1820, Sir Thomas Munro, then Governor of Madras, remarked: "Our present system of Government, by exclud-

⁴³ Sarkar, Benoy Kumar: *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus*, Leipzig, Verlag von Meiner & Peters, 1922.

ing all natives from trust and emoluments, is much more efficacious in depressing than all our laws and school books can do in elevating their character. We are working against our own designs, and we can expect to make no progress while we work with a feeble instrument to improve and a powerful one to deteriorate." ⁴⁴

In 1928, after more than 160 years of British rule, there was not any fundamental change in the above policy. The present nationalist movement of India is an endeavor to change the existing system. An American observer on the present situation in India writes "It was Warren Hastings who first acted upon the assumption that Indians could not be entrusted with authority to handle revenues and to administer justice. This assumption has been the prevailing influence in England's conduct of the affairs of India ever since, and it is in protest against this assumption that the people of India to-day have risen to a point of practically open rebellion against British domination" ⁴⁵

II

India is in open revolt against the British domination in India. The extra-ordinary thing

⁴⁴ Millard, Thomas F. ; Conflict of Policies in Asia. P. 27.

⁴⁵ Ibid. Page 28.

about this revolt is that it did not break out long ago, because the movement has a history of about hundred years. A British Civil Servant writes : "The growth of the nationalist sense and the desire for self-determination (of India) is not the work of one man.....In the conditions of our Indian Empire the coming of the unrest was inevitable and the only wonder was that, when it came, it was more violent." ⁴⁶ Within the limited space, it is not possible to give a detailed account of the movement of Indian Independence, but I shall endeavour to give a bare outline of its progress and tendencies.

First of all it must be remembered that the movement for Indian Independence dates long before 1857 or the out-break of the so-called Sepoy Mutiny. The Indian War of Independence of 1857 was the expression of the independent movement. If the war would have been successful and resulted in expulsion of British rulers from India, then the martyrs of 1857 would have been the heroes of War of Liberation of a nation from the hateful foreign yoke. The War of Independence of 1857 failed due to

⁴⁶ "Life In The Indian Civil Service" by Sir Evan Macnochie, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., I.C.S., (retired) London. Chapman & Hall. 1926. p. 122.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA

various causes and among them the principal ones are (a) some of the most important Indian Princes aided the British with men, money and every kind of support, (b) the people of the Punjab, especially the Sikhs did not join the national uprising, but aided the British, (c) while the British secured international support, the Indian Revolutionists of 1857 did not get any international aid; and in fact, the international situation was adverse to the Indian people, as Turkey was aiding Britain at least morally (d) lack of co-ordination among the various sections of Indian Revolutionists and better organization and leadership of the British.⁴⁷

Immediate result of an unsuccessful revolution is always depression. This happened also in the case of the movement for Indian Independence. In the face of the reign of terror, the movement was nothing more than under-ground activity on the part of the few who hoped for better days, but dared not to make a popular movement of their activities. Thus at least for a quarter of a century after the unsuccessful War of Independence of 1857, the movement for Indian Independence was a very hesitant one. Those who cherished the aspira-

47. The War of Indian Independence of 1857 by An Indian Nationalist.

tion of securing independence never dared to speak for the cause, and did not succeed in rousing popular interest. Indian leaders realised that the only movement which may have any chance for a limited success was constitutional agitation. A disarmed and friendless nation had to follow the path of slow toil.⁴⁸

Until 1884 Indian nationalism lay dormant, although the upper classes, particularly the intelligentsia, began to think of constitutional agitation and instituted a campaign of propaganda in a very small way. During this period India produced a band of men who were profoundly influenced by European social, governmental and educational methods; and the Indian National Congress movement was the medium through which they expressed themselves.⁴⁹ Before a constitutional agitation takes the form of a revolutionary movement, it generally passes through various stages of (a) popular demand of

⁴⁸ How a disarmed and defeated nation had to submit to unjust situation, against its national will, can be well understood from the fact that the defeated and partially disarmed Germany had to accept the unjust treaty of Versailles and Germany could not effectively resist the occupation of the Ruhr by the French forces.

⁴⁹ Banerjee, Sir Surendranath ; India, A Nation ; Oxford University Press. 1926.

securing equality before law, (b) demand for the right of enforcing the law and (c) demand for the right of making law without external interference. When all these demands are granted by the Ruling Power there may arise some friendly understanding and a bloody revolution may be averted. But when these demands are fulfilled only because the people succeeded in extracting concessions through vigorous efforts and sufferings, then concessions granted under pressure fail to avert a movement for Revolution and National Independence. This can be verified in the history of American Revolution, French Revolution, Russian and Chinese Revolutions. It is interesting to note the movement for constitutional agitation—the All India National Movement is following the course of ultimate Revolution.

Until 1905, the All India National Congress carried on a programme of constitutional agitation and appeal to the goodwill of the Government and people of England. But after twenty years of "begging" which produced no substantial results, a new spirit and a new extremist party came into being, coincident with the Administration of Lord Curzon, as the Viceroy of

India.⁵⁰ Autonomy and self-help were the visions of the younger group, encouraged by the renaissance of Asiatic self-consciousness which followed Japan's triumph over Russia. The difficulties encountered by the British in subduing the tiny Boer Nation also did much to stimulate the so-called extremists, who after 1905, became militant in their efforts to secure control of the All India National Congress and change its policy. The spiritual guides and the philosophers of the Independence movement of India at the beginning of the twentieth century were late Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, the poet Rabindranath Tagore, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Arabinda Ghose, Lajpat Rai and others who from obscurity did the greatest service to popularise the creed of Freedom. It is well to remember that Bengal played the dominant role and it was the "Swadeshi Samaj" which advocated the creation of a state within the state and published in 1904 it spread the philosophical content, of a far more radical political change than what Gandhi did under the garb of so-called Non-Co-operation movement. The young nationalists of India specially, were persecuted by the Government

⁵⁰ Besant, Annie : How India Wrought for Freedom.
) Banerjee : India's Nation Builders. New York, Brentano
) Cotton, Sir Henry : New India.

and opposed by the political leaders, but their activities continued underground and they were the first to make a systematic effort to reach the masses of the people and established net-work of organizations all over the country. The old political leaders of India, the founders of the Congress Movement, felt that they would lose hold over the national political movement, if they could not march forward *in response to the forward* vision and courageous activity of the younger generation and the Calcutta session of the All India National Congress held in 1906 under the presidentship of Dadabhai Naoroji struck the new note, as regards the aspirations of the Indian people. He said :—

“The whole matter can be compressed in one word, Self-Government, or Swaraj, like that of the United Kingdom or the colonies...Self-Government is the only and chief remedy. In Self-Government lie our hope, strength and greatnessBe united, persevere so that the millions now perishing by poverty, famine and plague and the scores of millions that are starving on scanty subsistence may be saved, and India may once more occupy her proud position of yore among the greatest and civilized Nations of West”.⁵¹

⁵¹ Besant, Annie : India—Bond or Free ? London, G. P. Putnam & Sons, page 158.

This is the official beginning of the Swaraj movement by the All India National Congress which had to, through the pressure of the so-called extremists, adopt the resolutions advocating "Swaraj" "Swadeshi" (patronising Indian goods) "Boycott" (of British goods) and "promotion of National Education." It may not be out of place to emphasise the fact that the above mentioned programme of the Nationalists were the foundation of Gandhi's Non-co-operation Movement. The advocates of Indian Independence, the young nationalists, tried to capture the Congress movement during the session of 1908, held at Surat. The so-called Moderates led by Gokhale, Surendranath Banerjee, Rash Behari Ghosh and others met the opposition of the Extremists led by Tilak, Arabinda Ghosh and others. Lajpat Rai who had the confidence of the so-called extremists played the role of a mediator, but the "machine-politics" of the Moderates won and the Extremists had to submit to constitutional programme or to leave the Congress movement. The fundamental difference between the so-called extremists and moderates of India was that the former believed that Indian patriots should work for the independence of India through all possible means, while the moderates believed that they should restrict

their activities within the sphere of constitutional agitation. The former believed in rousing the Indian masses while the latter believed in cultivating British public opinion.

It is the revolutionary activities of the nationalists, upholding the gospel of absolute independence of India that forced the British Government to grant the so-called Morely-Minto Reform.⁵² Indian nationalists, advocates of national Independence, started their work in an international scale, by establishing centres in London, Paris, Tokio and some of the large cities of the United States of America, while their activities in India met with the similar treatment as was accorded to the Russian Revolutionists under the regime of the Tsar. To get an idea of the ideology of the Indian nationalists, one should read such literature as the "*Bande Mataram*" (Hail Motherland), a Calcutta Daily, edited by Arabinda Ghose, the *Yugantar* (New Era) a Bengalee Weekly, published from Calcutta, *Sandhya* (Evening),—a Calcutta daily, published in Bengali, and such Bengali pamphlet as "*Muktee Kon Pathe*"—The Road to Freedom. It should be remembered that in 1907 when the

⁵² Earl Reading's Speech in Indian Assembly—A Challenge to Indian Statesman by Taraknath Dass—in the Review of Nov. 1925.

editor of *Jugantor* was prosecuted on the charge of sedition, the young Indian Nationalist Bhupendra nath Dutt (Now Dr.) was the first to declare in the court that "a court of an alien Government had no jurisdiction over him, as he did not recognise its existence and advocated complete independence of India." About the same time in the trial of a group of Bengal revolutionists charged with conspiracy and bomb-outrage, Barindra Kumar Ghose as their spokesman declared that they were not conspirators, but that they planned to wage open-war against the British to free their country from a hateful foreign yoke.

If one critically studies the genesis of the present movement for Indian Independence, he will find that the intelligentsia of India suffered the most. They, as idealists, did not fear to stake their lives and carried on the work of "*revolutionising the ideal of the national aspiration.*" As pioneers they had the hardest work to accomplish. They did their share effectively in India and outside of India.⁵³ suffering greatest hardship, the

⁵³ For the Indian activities outside of India, one should read the revolutionary publications "Free Hindusthan" (New York), Talvar and Bande Mataram (London and Paris), The publication of Hindusthan Gadar Party (San Francisco), and Friends of Freedom for India (New York) and Indian Nationalist Party of Europe.

ot of all champions of freedom. Their work should be regarded as the foundation of the Non-co-operation Movement and it resulted in the so-called Montague-Chelmsford Reform, known as the present Government of India Act of 1919.

During the World War, the Indian moderates sided with the British Government while the advocates of Indian Independence worked among the Indian soldiers and masses to spread further disaffection. M. K. Gandhi, the later-day rebel against the "satanic Government of Great Britain in India" was awarded medals of recognition by the British Government for his work as a recruiting sergeant. Gandhi, the true follower of late Gokhale, worked for India within the British Empire. He, altho' the world-recognized prophet of Non-violence, did the greatest violence to the cause of human freedom when he led Indians to fight for their oppressors against the Germans who never did any harm to the people of India. As an impartial student of history it must be recorded that Gandhi did not act as an idealist, but as an opportunist, who believed that by aiding the British in the greatest crisis of the Empire, the Indian people would gain some concession.

from India's oppressors. Gandhi lacked the vision of a Masaryck, the father of Czechoslovakia. While the British Government was pleased with the conduct of the Moderates of India, it acted relentlessly against the advocates of Indian Independence, by wholesale imprisonment, placing them in forts, Andaman islands and hanging many of them.

Delusion of Gandhi and others were somewhat removed after the massacre at Amritsar, the Bloody Sunday of Indian Independence Movement and the passage of the Rowlatt Act. The Calcutta Session of the All India National Congress (1919) led to the Non-co-operation movement. The Non-co-operation Movement roused the masses of India. It made the Indian Nationalist Movement a people's movement led by the intelligentsia as well as the leader of the masses. Four progressive steps in the Non-co-operation Movement advocated by M. K. Gandhi were as follows :—

“Firstly, to renounce all honorary posts, titles and membership to Legislative Councils.

“Secondly, to give up all remuneratory posts under the Government service.

“Thirdly, to give up all appointments in the Police and Military forces.

"Fourthly, to refuse to pay taxes to Government."

To gain the support of the Moslem community of India, Mahatma Gandhi supported the Khilafat movement in India, advocating that justice be done to the cause of Turkey. Moslem leaders joined with the Hindus and others to promote anti-British agitation.

But when the Non-co-operation movement led to violence Mahatma Gandhi opposed it. He also systematically opposed all proposals, declaring "Independence of India" as the goal of Indian Nationalist movement. The British Government at first arrested the most important leaders of the Indian Nationalists such as Lajpat Rai, late C. R. Das and thousands of young Nationalists and then began to undermine Hindu-Moslem solidarity by bringing about the settlement with Turkey, favorable to her national independence. Non-co-operation movement lost its original effectiveness, when practical statesmen like late C.R.Das as the President of the All India National Congress, held at Gaya in 1922, and others decided to follow the parbellite policy of capturing the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Councils by the Indian Swarajists and practise obstruction against the Government. Here began the actual (although

not nominal) loss of prestige of Gandhi among the Indian politicians and the revolutionists. The British Government also realised that it was the Swarajists under the leadership of C. R. Das and Pandit Moti Lal Nehru who were more dangerous than the Gandhites—advocates of Non-violent Non-co-operation.

The success of the Swarajists in capturing several of the provincial legislative councils and electing the largest number of the party in the Legislative Assembly led to special persecution of the Swarajists of Bengal who were best organized. The Swarajists by their political tactics proved to the world that the so-called Indian Parliament is nothing more than a joke and it had no more power of real legislation than the Russian Duma of the Tsarist era.

It was held by many Indians that the British Labor Government will support the cause of Indian Self-Government. But the Labor Government, under J. Ramsay MacDonald, sanctioned the passage of an Ordinance in Bengal, on October 25th, 1924. This was passed without consulting the Indian Legislative Assembly. This Ordinance has been made a law and it is still in force in Bengal. It is generally known

54 Horniman, B. G. "Amritsar and Our Duty To India" London-T. Fisher Unwin, 1920.

in India as "the Lawless Law" and hundreds of young men have been imprisoned without any trial.⁵⁵ This law sanctions:—(1) Arrests and house-searchings without warrant, (2) Trials of suspects connected with the movement for Indian Freedom, (3) "Commissioners appointed under the ordinance may take cognizance of offences without the accused being committed to them for trial, (4) The introduction of "any written statement of *any* person as valid evidence" in violation of the existing laws of evidence, without having the witness before them or being cross-examined, (5) Imprisonment of a suspect for a month without any charge, (6) Trial may not be held in open court, (7) and the accused is denied the right of employing any lawyer for his defence."⁵⁶ There are hundreds of Indian nationalists who are now in prison and who have been denied any form of trial. This is the British justice in India.

While the British authorities were practising the policy of repression the Indian Swarajists and others passed twice by overwhelming majority their demand that a Round Table

55 British White Paper on Bengal Ordinance of 1924 (House of Commons).

"Lawless Law in India" published by Forward Publishing Co. Calcutta.

56. Ibid.

Conference be held between the representatives of England and the people of India to draw up a National Constitution. In the course of debate some of the Indian leaders voiced the significant revolutionary sentiment that the British Parliament has no right to dictate over the Indian people. This sentiment marked the final stage of revolution in the demand of the Constitutional Agitation and Reform. In the meantime Indian moderates under the leadership of Dr. Annie Besant worked out a Bill—Commonwealth of India Bill—to be passed by the British Parliament as the next stage of reform in India leading to Dominion Status.⁵⁷

These activities in India made the British Tories as well as others realize that the British Government should at least make another gesture to demonstrate its willingness to confer further reforms if it can be established that they deserve it. The Tories, Liberals and Labor leaders in England joined in this conspiracy, ignoring the demand for a Round Table Conference.

During the latter part of 1927, the Conservative Government of Great Britain with

57. For the history of India Home Rule League and Commonwealth Bill etc. see Dr. Annie Besant's "India.....Bond or Free?"

the approval of both the Houses of the Parliament appointed a Royal Commission for India, with Sir John Simon as its Chairman. The Simon Commission, as it is popularly called, was authorized, according to the provisions of the Government of India Act of 1919, "to inquire into the working of the system of the Government, the growth of education, and the development of representative institutions in British India, and matters connected therewith, and the commission to report as to whether and to what extent it is desirable to establish the principle of responsible government or to extend, modify or restrict the degree of responsible government then existing therein, including the question whether the establishment of Second Chamber of local legislatures is or is not desirable. The Commission shall also inquire into and report on any other matter affecting British India and the provinces which may be referred to the Commission by His Majesty." This Simon Commission was composed of all Englishmen and Indians were excluded from it.

However, the publication of the news that the Commission will not include any Indian, stirred all self-respecting Indians, irrespective of party affiliations. Even the Indian Liberals, such as Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and others

declared in favor of boycotting the Commission, as its composition is a deliberate insult to India. Indian nationalists adopted the attitude that the people of India should boycott the Commission in the same way as the Milner Commission was boycotted by the Egyptians under the leadership of late Zaglul Pasha. ⁵⁸

Although some Indian Moslems and others showed their readiness to co-operate with the Simon Commission, but the agitation in favor of its being boycotted was so effective that Sir John Simon by a letter of February 1928, invited the Indian Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Assemblies to appoint Committees to collaborate with the Royal Commission under certain conditions, but not on equal terms. This concession was made because during the month of December, 1927, the All India National Congress, All India Liberal Federation, All India Moslem League and other organizations adopted firm attitude ⁵⁹ to boycott the Simon Commission ; and the Indian Legislative Assembly refused by a vote of overwhelming

58. "The Royal Commission For India and The Responsibility of Indian Nationalists"—by Taraknath Das, Published in the *Calcutta Review* of March, 1928

59 Resolutions favoring boycott of the Simon Commission are printed in the *Marhatta* (a weekly paper, published from Poona, India) of January, 1928.

majority, to appoint a Committee to co-operate with the Simon Commission.

In many ways the forty-second session of the All India National Congress held at Madras during the Christmas week of 1927 can be regarded as the turning point of the Indian Independence Movement. Under the leadership of younger leaders it adopted more progressive attitude in regard to its programme of activities. In spite of opposition of men like M. Gandhi, it adopted the resolution that "*This Congress declares the goal of the Indian people to be complete national Independence.*"

Dr. Ansari, the President-elect of the Congress, in his speech advocated that the Indian people "should consider Indian problems in their international setting and cultivate cultural relations and maintain friendly contact with Asiatic people." The Congress not only supported him in this matter, but adopted most far-reaching resolutions :—

"This Congress welcomes the formation of the League against Imperialism at the Congress against Imperialism held at Brussels in February, 1927, and approves of the decision of the All India Congress Committee to associate itself with this organization in the struggle against imperialism."

"The Congress demands that all Indian troops and police forces still in China be recalled immediately and that no Indian should go to China in future as agent of the British Government to fight or work against the Chinese people who, in the opinion of the Congress, are the comrades of the Indian people in their joint struggle against Imperialism.

"The Congress declares that the people of India have no quarrel with their neighbours and desire to live at peace with them, and asserts their right to determine whether or not they will take part in any war.

"The Congress demands that these war preparations (in the frontiers of India) be put an end to; and further declares that in the event of the British Government embarking on any war-like adventure and endeavouring to exploit India in it for the furtherance of their imperialist aims, it will be the duty of the people of India to refuse to take any part in such a war or to co-operate with them in any way whatsoever."

These resolutions indicate that All India National Congress has decided to enter into World Politics, to further the cause of Indian independence.

The same Congress also adopted a resolution

inviting the co-operation of all the political parties of India in drafting the Constitution for India. Nationalist India is marching on towards the acquisition of independence. One of the foremost young leaders of India, Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, of Calcutta, in his presidential address delivered before the Sixth Maharashtra Provincial Conference, held in Poona on May 3, 1928, has clearly declared: "Speaking for myself, I stand for an Independent Federal Republic; that is the ultimate goal which I have before me. I want India to be the mistress of her own destiny as she was in her palmy days so that she may develop according to her national genius. I want India to have full unfettered freedom so that she may stand with head erect among the free nations of the world. I want India to have the joy of complete liberty so that out of that joy she may create great things for herself and for the world. I want India to have her own flag, her own navy, her own army and her own ambassadors in the Capitals of free countries."

It is most interesting that Anglo-Indians and British autocrats have begun to recognize that the Indian people are earnest in the struggle for independence. One retired member of India Civil Service writes:—"The Nationalist Movement of India.....has certainly permeated

whole of 6,000,000 whom we have described as the educated class. No man in that class, whatever his religion may be, can be quite neutral. It is probably true that they are keen nationalists, unless there is some definite reason which keeps them out of the movement.....The dissidents are, however, very definitely in minority, and even groups like the Indian Christians who might have been afraid of Home Rule are swept into what is undoubtedly the popular movement.” 60 Others agree that “less directly, though perhaps more effectively, the situation in India is the product of a growing sense, among educated Indians, of collision between respective ideals of Oriental and Western civilization ; of a deepening aversion to the political and economic domination of the European alien...In reality the Swarajist and his supporters...postulate the continuance of the existing comparatively stable and efficient political and administrative organization, *but with the essential basis, British authority and control...(Their attitude) is an intensive expression of human interest of self-expression...The removal of the foreign domination at the earliest possible date is the main, the immediate desideratum. When the ground has*

60. An article on Indian Nationalist Movement by Mr. G. T. Garrat, published in the *New York Times* of May 20, 1928.

been cleared by that preliminary but all important measure, an emancipated India will be able at leisure to organize the future policy of the one-sixth of the human race. 61

Some far-sighted Englishmen in India realise that the present political situation is drifting to the same condition as was the case with Ireland before the granting of Free State. It is, according to Sir Charles Ross Alston and the *Pioneer* of Allahabad, an Anglo-Indian Daily, that the British Government should speedily make concession to the Indian people, leading to full Dominion Status. 62

As time goes by, the Moderate Indian nationalists will become more radical and none will be satisfied with any concessions unless the Indian people be accorded by their own right in full control over their National Defence, Foreign Policy and Internal Affairs. But it seems to many Indian Nationalists, as it has been expressed in the editorial of *Forward* of Calcutta, that the policy of granting concessions to India may prove to be "Too Late." 63

61. "Future of India and the Statutory Commission" in the *Asiatic Review* (London) April, 1928.

62. An editorial in *The Pioneer* of Allahabad, India, April, 25, 1928.

63. An editorial in the *Forward* of Calcutta, India, April, 24, 1928.

One thing is certain that for a nation of 320,000,000 people determined to be free, under the leadership of earnest men and women can never be kept in subjection eternally. Although Poland was partitioned among the three most powerful States of Europe, but a Free Poland after a century and half has come to existence, while the Imperial states have lost their hold over the free people. Similarly the people of India in course of time will assert their independence and there is no doubt about it.

APPENDIX I.

ANGLO-FRENCH DISCORD IN THE NEAR EAST AND INDIA

"It should not be overlooked that the first serious rift in Anglo-French relations since the war occurred over Syria. It has since grown to a chasm that threatens to engulf world peace ; but the beginning was in the Near East"

—*Editor and Publisher, Dec., 2. 1922.*

On this point the King-Crane Report on the Near East, a suppressed official document of the United States Government, throws some interesting light:

"It is evident that the French feel resentment towards the British as not having played a fair game in the Syrian area. Without going into historical details, the Sykes-Picot agreement provided that France should have ownership or influence in a large area, including Damascus and Cilicia and extending to Sivas and Harpoot while England should be in a similar position towards the former Turkish area southeast of this. At the present moment, France is threatened with the loss of all her sphere, while England complacently holds all that was then assigned to her, and extends her influence toward most of the rest.....The French for that the English took advantage of their dire necessity, by which they were obliged to be ke

APPENDIX V

CONDITION OF INDIAN WORKERS UNDER BRITISH RULE.

In 1927 British Trade Union Congress sent Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth to India, as fraternal delegates to the Indian Trade Union Congress of 1927. These British labor leaders after a travel of 27000 miles and three months' stay in India for the study of the condition of Indian workers, prepared a report on the condition of Indian workers. This report has been published by the General council of the Trade Union Congress. It is an indictment against the existing conditions in India. In parts it reads:—

“Indian workers are half-starved, badly clothed, and horribly housed”.

“And people living in this tragic poverty... and nearly all of them illiterate number over 300,000,000...more than half of the population of the British Empire.”

“And these conditions exist in the twentieth century, after 150 years of British rule.

“India for long has been regarded as a country, specially suitable for economic exploitation, supported by costly militarism and police. and it is upon those who have instituted and maintained the system and richly benefited from its working that the responsibility for keeping

so many millions of human beings in mental darkness and intellectual as well as material poverty must be placed."

The *Daily Herald* (London) commenting on the report, writes : -

"Hard upon Empire Day and its celebrations comes the report of Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth upon the condition of the workers in the most populous country of the Empire.

"It is a document which no British man or woman should be able to read without a sense of deep and lasting shame.

"The people of whose conditions of life it tells are majority of the people of the Empire. And they are living in a state of poverty, of squalor of physical misery of which few in this country can have any conception.

"They are, these millions, in a state of permanent semi-starvation. They live in hovels compared with which the vilest British slums would seem palatial. They are smitten with disease. They die off like flies. From birth to death they never know what it is to go unhungry, they never know comfort or cleanliness or decency. And they are the majority of the people of the British Empire. They have lived for over a century under British rule, And this is what it has brought them.

"The report cannot be read without hot shame. But to be shamed is no profit. Sympathy is of no profit. These Indian workers need neither a sense of shame nor sympathy. They need active help.

INDIA IN WORLD POLITICS

“For these conditions under which we live can be remedied. They are not the result of any law of nature. They are the direct result of ill-government and of a ruthless capitalism exploitation. They can, as Messrs Purcell and Hallsworth rightly declare, be speedily ended by industrial organization, discipline and action.”

FINIS

One thing is certain that for a nation of 320,000,000 people determined to be free, under the leadership of earnest men and women can never be kept in subjection eternally. Although Poland was partitioned among the three most powerful States of Europe, but a Free Poland after a century and half has come to existence, while the Imperial states have lost their hold over the free people. Similarly the people of India in course of time will assert their independence and there is no doubt about it.

APPENDIX I.

ANGLO-FRENCH DISCORD IN THE NEAR EAST AND INDIA

"It should not be overlooked that the first serious rift in Anglo-French relations since the war occurred over Syria. It has since grown to a chasm that threatens to engulf world peace ; but the beginning was in the Near East."

—*Editor and Publisher, Dec., 2. 1922.*

On this point the King-Crane Report on the Near East, a suppressed official document of the United States Government, throws some interesting light:

"It is evident that the French feel resentment towards the British as not having played a fair game in the Syrian area. Without going into historical details, the Sykes-Picot agreement provided that France should have ownership or influence in a large area, including Damascus and Cilicia and extending to Sivas and Harpoot while England should be in a similar position towards the former Turkish area southeast of this. At the present moment, France is threatened with the loss of all her sphere, while England complacently holds all that was then assigned to her, and extends her influence toward most of the rest.....The French feel that the English took advantage of their dire necessity, by which they were obliged be keep

practically all of their men in France, to occupy more than a due share of Syria, and to secure the affection of the Arabs.

“They also resent the payment by the English to the Emir Feisal of a large monthly subsidy which, they claim, covers a multitude of bribes, and enables the British to stand off and show clean hands while Arab agents do dirty work in their interest. They feel that in arming the Arabs the British are working against the French. They claim further that British are more or less directly responsible for the undeniably strong anti-French feeling shown by practically all the Moslem and non-Catholic Christian elements of Syria. *They feel that British has been unable to resist the desire to connect Egypt with Mesopotamia under one control as a bulwork of India and a new field for commercial exploitation.*

“It cannot be denied that some of the French contentions are difficult of refutation, and that the whole situation is such that British honor would seem cleaner if Britain were to withdraw wholly from Syria.....”

—*Editor and Publisher, Dec, 2. 1922.*
pp. xxii-xxiv.

The extent of British aid to Emir Feisal can be understood from the following extract of the same report :

“The British Government has been advancing money to his (Feisal's) Government for a long time, and at present allows it \$ 750,000 per month (£ 150,000). Of this Feisal draws

about \$ 200,000 per month for his personal expenses, staff, propaganda agents, etc. The balance is spent on the administration and the army of 7,000 and gendarmerie of 4,500 in supplement to the inadequate receipts from taxation."

—*Idid*, page xxiv.

We often hear that if Britain leaves India, India will be overrun by the Moslems, but here we see that in order to cement British supremacy from Egypt to Mesopotamia, as the bulwark of India, Britain is spending millions of dollars for the Arab Moslems against France. Such men as Sir Gilbert Parker, Sir Philip Gibbs, Mr. Ratcliffe and others are warning the world, particularly the Americans, that in effect civilization is being menaced by Islamic hordes, but here we have the proof that Britain is aiding the Arab Moslems. Some day Arab soldiers may be used against the uprising in India as the Indian soldiers have been used in Egypt, Persia, China, Turkey and other parts of the world.

The Anglo-French discord in the Near East, Britain's friendly attitude towards Emir Feisal and opposition to the Angora Government headed by Kemal Pasha, and France's opposition to the Arabs and friendship towards the Turks proves that the Near Eastern question is neither a question of conflict between Islam and Christianity, nor of racial conflict, but a question of extension of European supremacy in Asia in which the question of India plays a very important part.

APPENDIX II

British Labour Government's Opposition to Egyptian Independence.

Despatch of His Majesty's High Commissioner for Egypt and the Sudan respecting the Position of His Majesty's Government in regard to Egypt and the Sudan.

Foreign Office, October 7, 1924.

My Lord,

In the course of my conversations with the Egyptian Prime Minister His Excellency explained to me the modifications in the *status due* in Egypt on which he felt bound to insist. If I correctly understood him they were as follows :—

(a) The withdrawal of all British forces from Egyptian territory.

(b) The withdrawal of the financial and judicial advisers.

(c) The disappearance of all British control over the Egyptian Government, notably in connection with foreign relations which, Zaglul Pasha claimed, were hampered by the notification of His Majesty's Government to foreign Powers on the 15th of March, 1922, that they would regard as an unfriendly act any attempt at interference in the affairs of Egypt by another Power.

(d) The abandonment by His Majesty's Government of their claim to share in any way in protecting the Suez Canal.

BRITISH LABOUR GOVERNMENT'S OPPOSITION

As regards the Sudan, I draw attention to certain statements which His Excellency had made as President of the Council of Ministers before the Egyptian Parliament during the course of the summer. On the 17th May, according to my information, Zaglul Pasha stated that the fact that Foreign Officer was Commander-in-chief of the Egyptian Army and the retention in that army of British Officers were inconsistent with the dignity of independent Egypt. The expression of such sentiments in an official pronouncement by the responsible head of the Egyptian Government has obviously placed not only Sir Lee Stack as Sirdar, but all British Officers attached to the Egyptian army, in a difficult position. I also had in my mind that, in June Zaglul Pasha was reported to have claimed for Egypt complete rights of ownership over the Sudan and characterised the British Government as usurpers.

His Excellency observed that in making the above statements he was merely voicing the opinion not only of the Egyptian Parliament of the Egyptian nation, and I gathered that he still adhered to that position. Such statements, however, must inevitably have affected the minds of the Egyptians employed in the Sudan, and of the Sudanese personnel of the Egyptian army. They have made it appear that loyalty to the Egyptian Government is something different from and inconsistent with loyalty to the existing administration of the Sudan. As a result, not only has there been an entire change of spirit of Anglo-Egyptian co-operation which has in the past prevailed in the Sudan, but also Egyptian subjects serving under the Sudan

Government have been encouraged to regard themselves as propagandists of the Egyptian Government's views, with results that, if persisted in, in the absence of any agreement, would render their presence in the Sudan under the existing regime a source of danger to public order.

I promised in the course of our first conversation to be perfectly frank with His Excellency. Then and subsequently I left him under no illusion as to the position which His Majesty's Government are compelled to take up in regard to Egypt and the Sudan. Your Lordship will recall that when His Majesty's Government withdrew the British protectorate over Egypt in 1922, they reserved certain matters for eventual settlement by agreement. Though I have by no means abandoned hope that on further consideration, the basis of an agreement acceptable to both countries can be found, the attitude adopted by Zaglul Pasha has rendered such agreement impossible for the present. *I raised the question of the Canal straight away, because its security is of vital interest to us both in peace and war.* It is no less true to-day than in 1922 that the security of the communications of the British Empire in Egypt remains a vital British interest and that absolute certainty for the passage of British ships is the foundation on which the entire strategy of the British Empire rests. The 1888 Convention for the free navigation of the Canal was an instrument devised to secure that object. Its ineffectiveness for this purpose was demonstrated in 1914, when Great Britain herself had to take steps to ensure that the Canal would remain open. No British

Government in the light of that experience can divest itself wholly, even in favour of an ally, of its interest in guarding such a vital link in British communications. *Such a security must be a feature of any agreement come to between our two Governments*, and I see no reason why accommodation is impossible, given good will.

The effective co-operation of Great Britain and Egypt in protecting those communications might, in my view, have been ensured by the conclusion of a treaty of close alliance. The presence of a British force in Egypt provided for by such a treaty, freely entered into by both parties on an equal footing, would in no way be incompatible with Egyptian independence, whilst it would be an indication of the specially close and intimate relations between the two countries and their determination to co-operate in a matter of vital concern to both. It is not the wish of His Majesty's Government that this force should in any way interfere with the functions of the Egyptian Government or encroach upon Egyptian sovereignty and I emphatically said so. It is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to assume any responsibility for the actions or conduct of the Egyptian Government or to attempt to control or direct the policy which that Government may see fit to adopt.

So far as my conversations with Zaglul Pasha turned on the question of the Sudan, they have only served to show his persistence in the attitude disclosed in his previous public utterances. I must adhere to the statement I

made on the subject in the House of Commons. About that neither in Egypt nor in the Sudan should there be any doubt. If there is, it will only lead to trouble.

In the meantime the duty of preserving order in the Sudan rests in fact upon His Majesty's Government and they will take every step necessary for this purpose. Since going there, they have contracted heavy moral obligations by the creation of a good system of administration; they cannot allow that to be destroyed; they regard their responsibilities as a trust for the Sudan people; there can be no question of their abandonig the Sudan until their work is done.

His Majesty's Government have no desire to disturb existing arrangements, but they must point out how intolerable is a *status quo* which enables both military and civil officials to conspire against civil order, and unless the *status quo* is accepted and loyally worked until such time as a new arrangement may be reached, the Sudan Government would fail in its duty were it to allow such conditions to continue.

His Majesty's Government have never failed to recognise that Egypt has certain material interests in the Sudan which must be guaranteed and safeguarded.....these being chiefly concerned with her share of the Nile water and the satisfaction of any financial claims which she may have against the Sudan Government. His Majesty's Government have always been prepared to secure these interests in a way satisfactory to Egypt.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA

I have in the preceding paragraphs defined the position which His Majesty's Government are compelled to take up in regard to Egypt and the Sudan and which I conceive it to be my duty to conserve unimpaired.

I am etc.

J. Ramsay Mac Donald.

APPENDIX III

BRITISH EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH A PROTECTORATE OVER PERSIA THROUGH AN ANGLO-PERSIAN AGREEMENT

No. 1.

Test of the Agreement between His Britannic Majesty's Government and the Persian Government, signed at Teharan, August. 9. 1919.

*(The British Parliamentary paper.....Persia
No. 1 (1919) Cmd. 300)*

TEST OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND PERSIA;

Preamble : In virtue of the close ties of friendship which have existed between the two Governments in the past, and in the convictions that it is in the essential and mutual interests of both in future that these ties should be cemented, and that the progress and prosperity of Persia should be promoted to the utmost, it is hereby agreed between the Persian Government on the one hand, and His Majesty's Minister, acting on behalf of His Government on the other, as follows :—

1. The British Government reiterate, in the most categorical manner, the undertakings which they have repeatedly given in the past to respect absolutely the independence and integrity of Persia.

2. The British Government will supply at the cost of the Persian Government, the services of whatever expert advisers may, after consultation between the two Governments, be considered necessary for the several departments of the Persian Administration. These advisers shall be engaged on contracts and endowed with adequate powers, the nature of which shall be the matter of agreement between the Persian Government and advisers.

3. The British Government will supply, at cost of the Persian Government, such officers and such munitions and equipment of modern type as may be adjudged necessary by a joint commission of military experts, British and Persian, which shall assemble forthwith for the purpose of estimating the needs of Persia in respect of the formation of a uniform force which the Persian Government proposes to create for the establishment and preservation of order in the country and on its frontiers.

4. For the purpose of financing the reforms indicated in the clauses 2 and 3 of this agreement, the British Government offer to provide or arrange a substantial loan for the Persian Government for which adequate security shall be sought by the two Governments in consultation in the revenues of the customs or other sources of income at the disposal of the Persian Government. Pending the completion of negotiations for such a loan the British Government will supply on account of it such funds as may be necessary for initiating the said reforms.

5. The British Government fully recognising the urgent need which exists for the improvement of communications in Persia, with a view both to the extension of trade and the prevention of famine, are prepared to co-operate with the Persian Government for the encouragement of Anglo-Persian enterprises in this direction, both by means of railway construction and other forms of transport; subject always to the examination of the problems by experts and to agreement between the two Governments as to the particular project which may be most necessary, practicable and profitable.

6. The two Governments agree to the appointment forthwith of a joint Committee of experts for the examination and revision of the existing Customs Tariff with a view to its reconstruction on a basis calculated to accord with the legitimate interests of the country and to promote its prosperity.

(Signed at Teharan, August, 8, 1919.)

No. 2.

AGREEMENT RELATING TO LOAN OF £2,000,000
AT 7 PER CENT. REDEEMABLE IN TWENTY YEARS.

Preamble:—Contract between the British Government and the Persian Government with reference to an agreement concluded this day between the said Government. It is agreed as follows:—

Article I. The British Government grant a loan of 2,000,000 sterling to the Persian Govern-

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA

ment, to be paid to the Persian Government as required in such instalments and at such dates as may be indicated by the Persian Government after the British Financial Adviser shall have taken up the duties of his office at Teharan, as provided for in the aforesaid agreement.

Article 2. The Persian Government undertakes to pay interest monthly at the rate of 7% per annum upon sums advanced in accordance with article I upto the 20th March, 1921, and thereafter to pay monthly such amount as will suffice to liquidate the principal sum and interest thereon at 7 per cent. per annum in twenty years.

Article 3. All the revenues and Customs receipts assigned in virtue of the contract of the 8th May, 1911* for the payment of the loan of 1,250,000 are assigned for the repayment of the present loan with continuity of all conditions stipulated in the said contract and with priority over all debts other than the 1911 loan and subsequent advances made by the British Government. In case of insufficiency of the receipts indicated above, the Persian Government undertakes to make good the necessary sums from other resources, and for this purpose the Persian Government hereby assigns to the service of the present loan, and of the other advances above mentioned, in priority and with continuity of conditions stipulated in the aforesaid contract, the customs receipts of all other regions, in so far as these receipts are or shall be at its disposal.

*See No. 3.

Article 4. The Persian Government will have the right of repayment of the present loan at any date out of the proceeds of any British loan which it may contract for.

Signed at Teharan, August 9, 1919.

No 3.

ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONTRACT BETWEEN THE PERSIAN GOVERNMENT AND THE IMPERIAL BANK OF PERSIA RELATING TO THE PERSIAN GOVERNMENT FIVE PER CENT. LOAN OF £1,250,000 OF MAY 8, 1911.

(*Included for reference*)

5. The Imperial Government of Persia specially assigns to the service of the loan and as a first charge thereon. subject only to prior charges amounting to £15,714. 1s. 14d. per annum for three years, and £30,278. 12s. 7d. per annum from the year 1913 to the year 1928. The full net customs receipts of every description which the Government now is, or at any time hereafter may be, entitled to collect and receive at all parts of places in the Persian Gulf, including Bushire, Bunder, Abbas, Lingah, Mohammerah, and Ahwaz, which receipts are hereby made payable to the Bank, and the Imperial Government of Persia hereby engages forthwith after receipt thereof to pay to the Bank all such Customs receipts as aforesaid without deduction

other than for actual expenses of administration of the customs of the said ports disbursed prior to the date of such payment.

(a) The Imperial Government of Persia undertakes that throughout the continuance of the loan all sums collected by the Customs Administration shall be paid to the Bank at ports of collection or at its nearest branch, week by week for meeting the prior charges referred to above and for the service of the loan, and an account of such receipts shall be submitted to the Persian Government by the Bank at the end of each month.

(b) The bank shall, out of the moneys so collected, pay prior charges above-mentioned, and the interest and sinking fund of the loan, and shall hold the surplus at the disposal of the Imperial Government of Persia.

(c) The bank undertakes, out of the moneys so received, to pay on behalf of the Imperial Government of Persia the half-yearly coupon in London, and supervise the working of the sinking fund and service of the loan free of charges connected with the same.

(d) In the event of the Customs receipts of the above-mentioned parts for any three months falling short of the amount required for the prior charges and the service of the loan, either for interest or amortisation, the Imperial Government of Persia binds itself to make good such deficiency from other sources of Government revenue, and further should receipts from these sources fall below the amount required as above, the Persian Government hereby assigns for this

purpose the revenue derived from the receipts of the telegraphs—this assignment to constitute a second charge on the said telegraph receipts upto the year 1928, after which the telegraph receipts will be free.

No 4.

SIR P. COX TO HIS HIGHNESS VISSUG-
ED-DOWLESH, BRITISH LEGATION, TEHARAN,
AUGUST 9, 1919.

Your Highness,

I trust your Highness has been able, during your successful direction of affairs of the Persian State, to convince yourself that His Britannic Majesty's Government have always endeavoured to support to the utmost the efforts of your Highness's cabinet on the one hand to restore order and security in the interior of the country, and on the other to maintain a policy of close co-operation between the Persian and British Governments.

As further evidence of the goodwill by which cabinet of London is inspired, I am now honoured to inform your Highness that, in the light of the agreement regarding projects of reforms which your Government contemplates introducing in Persia being concluded, His Britannic Majesty's Government will be prepared to take the course to co-operate with the Persian

Government with a view to the realisation of the following desiderata :—

1. The revision of the treaties actually in force between the two powers.

2. The claim of Persia to compensation for material damage suffered at the hands of other belligerents.

3. The rectification of the frontier of Persia at the points where it is agreed upon by the parties to be justifiable.

I have &c.

Sd/- P. Z. Cox.

No. 5.

SIR, P. COX TO HIS HIGHNESS VISSUG-
ED-DAWISH, BRITISH LEGATION, TEHARAN,
AUGUST 9, 1919.

Your Highness,

With reference to the second desideratum indicated in my previous letter of to-day's date, it is understood and agreed between the two Governments reciprocally that, on the one hand, His Majesty's Government were obliged to send to Persia owing to Persia's want of power to defend her neutrality, and that on the other hand the Persian Government will not claim from the British Government an indemnity for any damage which may have caused by the said troops during their presence in Persian territory.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA

It is to be understood, however, ^{that this} ~~that~~ agreement of the two parties does not ^{in any} ~~not~~ way affect the claims of individuals and ^{private} ~~and~~ institutions, which will be dealt ^{with} ~~with~~ independently.

A note from your Highness ^{informing me} ~~informing~~ that you accept this position on behalf of the Persian Government will suffice to ^{record the} ~~record~~ Agreement of the two Governments ^{on this} ~~on~~ subject.

I have etc.
(Signed) P. Z. Cox.

APPENDIX IV

AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND TRANS-JORDONIAN, SIGNED IN JERUSALEM, ON FEBRUARY 20, 1928.

(*British Parliamentary Papers—CMD. 3069*)

Whereas His Britannic Majesty, in virtue of a mandate entrusted to Him on July 24, 1922, has authority in the area covered thereby; and whereas His Highness the Emir of Transjordanian has set up an Administration in that part of the area under Mandate known as Transjordanian; and whereas His Britannic Majesty is prepared to recognize the existence of an independent Government in Transjordanian under the rule of His Highness the Emir of Transjordanian, provided that such Government is constitutional and places His Britannic Majesty in a position to fulfil his international obligations in respect of that territory by means of an Agreement to be concluded with His Highness.

Now, therefore, His Britannic Majesty and His Highness the Emir of Transjordanian have resolved to conclude an Agreement for these purposes, and to that end have appointed as their plenipotentiaries :—

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, and Emperor of India.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland :—
Field Marshall the Right Honorable Lord
Plumer, G. C. B., G. C. M. G., G. C. V. O., G. B. E.

His Highness the Emir of Transjordanian,
Hassan Khaled Pasha Abdul Huda ;

Who having communicated their full powers,
found in good and due form, have agreed as
following :—

ARTICLE 1.

His Highness the Emir agrees that His
Britannic Majesty shall be represented in
Transjordanian by a British Resident acting on
behalf of the High Commissioner for Transjor-
donian, and that communications between His
Britannic Majesty and all other powers on one
hand and the Transjordanian Government on
the other shall be made through the British
Resident and the High Commission aforesaid.

His Highness the Emir agrees that the
ordinary expenses of civil Government and
administration and the salaries and expenses of
the British Resident and his staff will be borne
entirely by the Transjordanian. His Highness
the Emir will provide quarters for the accom-
modation of British members of the staff of
the British Resident.

ARTICLE 2.

The powers of Legislation and of adminis-
tration entrusted to His Britannic Majesty as
Mandatory for Palestine shall be exercised in
that part of the area under Mandate known as

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA

Transjordanian by His Highness the Emir through such constitutional Government as is defined and determined in the Organic Law of Transjordanian and any amendment thereof made with the approval of His Britannic Majesty.

Throughout the remaining clauses of this Agreement the word "Palestine" unless otherwise defined, shall mean that portion of the area under Mandate which lies to the west of a line drawn from a point two miles west of the town of Akaba on the gulf of the same up the centre of the Wady Araba, Dead Sea, and River Jordan to its junction with the river Yarmuk ; thence up the centre of that river to the Syrian frontier.

ARTICLE 3.

His Highness the Emir agrees that for the period of the present Agreement no official of other than Transjordanian nationality shall be appointed in Transjordanian without the concurrence of His Britannic Majesty. The number and conditions of employment of British officials so appointed in the Transjordanian Government shall be regulated by a separate Agreement.

ARTICLE 4.

His Highness the Emir agrees that all such laws, orders or regulations as may be required for the full discharge of the international responsibilities and obligations of His Britannic Majesty in respect of the territory of

Transjordanian shall be adopted or made in Transjordan which may hinder the full discharge of such international responsibilities and obligations.

ARTICLE 5.

His Highness the Emir agrees to be guided by the advice of His Britannic Majesty tendered through the High Commissioner for Transjordan in all matters concerning foreign relations of Transjordan, as well as in all important matters affecting the international and financial obligations and interests of His Britannic Majesty in respect of Transjordan. His Highness the Emir undertakes to follow an administration, financial and fiscal policy in Transjordan, such as will ensure the stability and good organisation of His Government and its finances. He agrees to keep His Britannic Majesty informed of the measures proposed and adopted to give due effect to this undertaking, and further agrees not to alter the system of control of the public finances of Transjordan without the consent of His Britannic Majesty.

ARTICLE 6.

His Highness the Emir agrees that he will refer for the advice of His Britannic Majesty the annual Budget law and any law which concerns matters covered by the provisions of this Agreement and any law of any of the following classes, namely :—

(1) Any law affecting the currency of Transjordan in relation to the issue of bank notes.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA

(2) Any law imposing differential duties.

(3) Any law whereby persons who are nationals of any State, members of the League of Nations or of any State to which His Britannic Majesty has agreed by treaty that the same rights should be ensured as it would enjoy if it were a member of the said League, may be subjected or made liable to any disabilities to which persons who are British subjects or nationals of any foreign State are also subjected or made liable.

(4) Any special law providing for succession to the Emir's throne or for the establishment of a Council of Regency.

(5) Any law whereby the grant of land or money or other donation or gratuity may be made to himself.

(6) Any law under which the Emir may assume sovereignty over territory outside Transjordan.

(7) Any law concerning the jurisdiction of the Civil Courts over foreigners.

(8) Any law altering, amending or adding to the details of the provisions of the Organic Law.

ARTICLE 7.

Except by agreement between the two countries there shall be no Customs barrier between Palestine and Transjordan, and the Customs tariff in Transjordan shall be approved by the Britannic Majesty.

The Government of Palestine shall pay to Transjordan Government the estimated amount of Customs duties levied on the part of the

goods entering Palestine from territory other than Transjordan which subsequently enters Transjordan for local consumption, but shall be entitled to withhold from the sums to be paid on this account the estimated amount of Customs duties levied by Transjordan on that part of the goods entering Transjordan from other than Palestine territory, which subsequently enters Palestine for local consumption. The Trade and commerce of Transjordan shall receive at Palestinian ports equal facilities with the trade and commerce of Palestine.

ARTICLE 8.

So far as is consistent with the international obligations of His Britannic Majesty no obstacles shall be placed in the way of the association of Transjordan for Customs or other purposes with such neighboring Arab States as may desire it.

ARTICLE 9.

His Highness the Emir undertakes that he will accept and give effect to such reasonable provisions as His Britannic Majesty may consider necessary in judicial matters to safeguard the interests of foreigners.

These provisions shall be embodied in a separate agreement which shall be communicated to the Council of the League of Nations, and, pending the conclusion of such Agreement, no foreigner shall be before a Transjordan Court without the concurrence of His Britannic Majesty.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN INDIA

His Highness the Emir undertakes that he will accept and give effect to such reasonable provisions as His Britannic Majesty may consider necessary in Judicial matters to safeguard the law jurisdiction with regard to questions arising out of the religious beliefs of the different religious communities.

ARTICLE 10.

His Britannic Majesty may maintain armed forces in Transjordan, and may raise, organise and control in Transjordan such armed forces as may, in His opinion, be necessary for the defence of the country and to assist His Highness the Emir in the preservation of peace and order.

His Highness the Emir agrees that he will not raise or maintain in Transjordan, or allow to be raised or maintained any military forces without the consent of His Britannic Majesty.

ARTICLE 11.

His Highness the Emir recognises the principle that the cost of the forces required for the defence of Transjordan is a charge on the revenue of that territory. At the coming into force of this Agreement, Transjordan will continue to bear one-sixth of the cost of the Transjordan Frontier Force, and will also bear as soon as the financial resources of the country permit, the excess of the cost of the British forces stationed in Transjordan, so far as such forces may be deemed by His Britannic Majesty to be employed in respect of Transjordan over the cost

